

THE AMERICAN ✠ CHURCH ✠ MONTHLY

Selden Peabody Delany, D.D., Editor

February, 1921

Vol. 8 No. 6

Editorial Comment	- - - -	463
The Church Congress—The Sins of the Fathers —Marriage and the Family—The Association for the Sanctity of Marriage—Limitations at Lambeth—Bolshevist Asceticism.		
Communication With the Departed	- -	473
<i>William Harman von Allen</i>		
The Silence of Jesus Christ	- - -	492
<i>Charles C. Marshall</i>		
The Crisis in the Episcopal Church	- -	511
<i>Gilbert Pember</i>		
The Imperative Need for Good Church Schools		518
<i>John H. Yates</i>		
The Gift of Counsel	- - - -	528
<i>Frank H. Hallock</i>		
St. Agatha for February	- - -	537
<i>Minna Caroline Smith</i>		
The Church and Social Problems, IV	- -	539
<i>Clinton Rogers Woodruff</i>		

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, New Brunswick, N. J., under act of March 3, 1873

Issued by the TEMPLE PUBLISHING CO., 1 and 3 Peace Street
New Brunswick, New Jersey

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager
11 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.

Increase of Price

March, 1921

IT is with great regret that the publishers of the AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY feel compelled to announce that beginning with the March issue the price of subscription for a year will be Three Dollars. The steadily increasing cost of production has long ago forced most publications to increase their charge, but we have kept ours down in the effort to make it more readily within the reach of all. It is clear to us now, however, that we can expect no speedy change for the better, and we are confident that our readers will cheerfully do their part in meeting the present necessity. After all, where today can reading matter of the same character and amount, be purchased for so low a figure?

FOR LENT

Christian Practice

By SELDEN PEABODY DELANY, DD.

12mo, 260 pages

Dr. Delany, in this, his latest book, has given to the Church an invaluable guide to Christian living. Amid the welter of rationalistic and purely sentimental so-called religious literature that is pouring from our presses, this is a refreshingly sensible, orthodox, and conservative statement of the duty of a Christian. This is, first and foremost, to make his own life correspond to the Christian ideal, rather than to set himself up as the censor and reformer of others, and then so to live that life, that he may become an example to his neighbors.

In twenty-eight incisively written chapters, each one treating its subject with remarkable clearness and fullness, despite brevity, the author has touched on matters that interest all who seek to lead the Christian life. Some of these topics are,—The Christian Life, Regeneration, The Christian Society, Divisions of Christendom, The Struggle with Temptation, The Observation of Sunday, Money and the Soul, The Science of Self Control, Sickness and Pain, Obligation to Society, The Fear of Hell, and The Hope of Heaven.

What is outstanding in the treatment of these subjects, and all the others, is the author's sound common sense, his insistence on the Truth of the Church's Teaching, and the practical helpfulness of his counsel and suggestions. The book has no superior in our Religious Literature in the qualities that can make it helpful to any one seeking a practical, livable, manly and womanly Religion.

Ready

Price \$2.00

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Publisher

11 WEST 45TH ST.

NEW YORK

CONTRIBUTORS FOR FEBRUARY

The Rev. William Harman van Allen, D.D., L.H.D., D.C.L., LL.D., is the Rector of the Church of the Advent, Boston, Mass.

Charles C. Marshall, of New York City and Millbrook, is a member of the New York bar.

The Rev. Gilbert E. Pember is the Rector of St. Michael's Church, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.

The Rev. John H. Yates is the Rector of St. Mark's Church, Waterville, Me.

The Rev. Frank H. Hallock is Professor of Old Testament Literature and Theology in Seabury Divinity School, Faribault, Minn.

Minna Caroline Smith is a New York churchwoman, who often writes for magazines.

Clinton Rogers Woodruff is a well-known attorney and churchman of Philadelphia, who has written much on social and municipal subjects.

The American Church Monthly

*A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing
with questions confronting the Anglican Communion
and more especially the Church in the United States*

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION

1-3 Peace St., New Brunswick, N. J.

President: GEORGE A. ARMOUR, Princeton, N. J.

Vice-President: GUY VAN AMRINGE, 55 Liberty Street, New York

Secretary: THE REV. CHARLES C. EDMUNDS, D.D., 6 Chelsea Square, New York

Treasurer: HALEY FISKE, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

Two Dollars a Year
Canadian subscription, \$2.25 a Year

Twenty-five Cents a Copy
Foreign subscription. \$2.50 a Year

Volume VIII.

FEBRUARY, 1921

Number 6

The Church Congress

THE Church Congress which met at Rochester, N. Y., in the month of December was the best that has been held for many years. The local committee had made thorough preparation and had given the Congress the needed publicity. In consequence the sessions were exceedingly well attended by the people of the city. The papers and extemporaneous addresses were for the most part of a high order.

It has been found by experience that a Church Congress is much more successful in cities the size of Rochester than in more metropolitan centers. In the largest cities it is impossible to obtain sufficient publicity to induce people to

forsake their customary attractions to attend sessions of the Church Congress.

Such a Congress is of great value to the church. It makes possible the free discussion of vital questions before the church, which ought to be thoroughly aired before any action is taken by the general convention or the diocesan synods of the church. Abundant opportunity is afforded for the interchange of opinion; and thus each side may the better come to understand and appreciate the position of the other side in any controversy. It would exert a most salutary influence upon the life of the whole church if representatives of the different schools of thought could come together more frequently and meet each other socially and discuss their differences. In religious controversy it is peculiarly true that to understand all is to pardon all. *Tout comprendre c'est tout pardonner.*

The effect of the Church Congress upon the church people in the city where it meets is also in the main beneficial. It helps to awaken in them an interest in the larger and less parochial problems of the church. It is also salutary for them to see clergy and laymen who hold quite opposite opinions meeting together amicably and discussing their differences good-naturedly. It gives them a sense of the comprehensiveness and tolerance of the church and of the wide freedom of thought that is allowed within her borders.

In the Congress at Rochester Catholics were well represented among the appointed speakers. The Executive Committee of the Congress had made a conscientious attempt to secure the best speakers from each school of thought on every subject. We wish that Catholics in general were more willing and eager to take part in the Church Congress, not only as assigned speakers and writers, but as interested

spectators who would often make impromptu speeches. If our position on any ecclesiastical or theological question is such that it cannot be defended in debate and commended to the better judgment of churchmen of all shades of theological opinion, then we should abandon that position. If, on the other hand, the Catholic position is such that it can be defended, then by all means let us send our best men to lead and join in the discussions, in order that we may gain as wide a hearing as possible in the church for the beliefs and practices which we champion. What should be avoided, of course, is everything in the way of bitterness or rancour or malicious personal attacks. The Church Congress at Rochester was remarkably free from such defects, although there were a few lapses from the broadminded Christian charity which ought to prevail in such a gathering.

If we may venture a word of constructive criticism, we would suggest that it would be better for the Congress and more edifying for the townspeople if the clergy present from other cities would make more of an effort to attend the early eucharists in the various city churches during the Congress. The reverent and beautiful services so generously provided by the rectors of St. Luke's and St. Andrew's were shamefully neglected.

The Sins of the Fathers

THE evils of disunion from which all followers of Christ are suffering today are due not so much to our own erroneous beliefs or defective practices or proud self-will as to the sins of our fathers. It is what men have done in the past that has brought about the lamentable schisms in the Body of Christ. It is probably true that the vast majority

of Christians today are filled with a deep, yearning desire for reunion. Why must we go on any longer held down and strangled by the dead hand of our ancestors?

One of the most encouraging features of the Lambeth pronouncements was the true Christian humility with which the bishops took upon themselves as representing the Anglican communion their share of the blame. Nothing could be better than this humble frankness as expressed in the appeal of the bishops:

The causes of division lie deep in the past, and are by no means simple or wholly blameworthy. Yet none can doubt that self-will, ambition, and lack of charity among Christians have been the principal factors in the mingled process, and that these, together with blindness to the sin of disunion, are still mainly responsible for the breaches of Christendom. We acknowledge this condition of broken fellowship to be contrary to God's will, and we desire frankly to confess our share in the guilt of thus crippling the Body of Christ and hindering the activity of His Spirit.

It is most refreshing to find in *Blackfriars*, a monthly review published by the Dominicans in London, an equally frank admission that Rome, too, has been guilty of sin. We quote from an article in the October number of that review, entitled "Canterbury and Rome," the following remarkable passage:

We of the Roman Catholic Church, i. e. the *Ecclesia Latina* and the *Ecclesia Orientalis* (*Codex Juris Canonici. Can. 1*), will not allow our separated brethren to accept all the sin of disunion. Long before disunion came, our saints and prophets saw it coming. They denounced it as a crime; but they denounced still more the crimes of those even in the highest quarters which brought it into being.

Even today our people are taught to look upon the upheaval of the sixteenth century as an effect of their own sins. "Gradually a regrettable worldliness manifested itself in many high ecclesiastics.

Their chief object, viz. to guide man to his eternal goal, claimed too seldom their attention, and worldly activities became in too many cases the chief interest. Political power, material possessions * * * earthly interests of various kinds were only too often the chief aim of many of the higher clergy. Pastoral solicitude, the specifically religious and ecclesiastical aim, fell largely into the background, notwithstanding various spirited and successful attempts to rectify the existing evils. Closely connected with the above were various abuses in the lives of the clergy and the people. In the Papal Curia political interests and a worldly life were often prominent. Many bishops and abbots bore themselves as secular rulers rather than as servants of the Church. * * * The scientific and ascetic training of the clergy left much to be desired, the moral standard of many being very low, and the practice of celibacy not everywhere observed." If we have quoted this passage from such a representative and widely read work as the Catholic Encyclopædia (Vol. XII, p. 700. Art., Reformation) it is not for its authoritativeness or for our agreement with its findings. Indeed, we should not be surprised if the writer of the article has painted his picture in colours too dark for the truth. But for that very reason the quotation is irrefutable as an indication of the Church's present desire to acknowledge its share in the responsibility of disunion. This makes towards hope. When two parties in a quarrel cannot outdo each other in accepting blame the end of the quarrel is in sight.

Marriage and the Family

FAMILY life in America is evidently in a bad way. The high cost of living, the housing situation, the increase of divorce, the growing economic independence of women, and the difficulty of bearing and rearing children, are menacing factors which threaten the destruction of our traditional ideals of family life. Reformers and magazine writers and

novelists are offering all sorts of radical remedies: greater facility for divorce, birth control, trial marriages, the abdication of parental responsibility and the turning over all children to the state. The latest progressive suggestion is unmarried motherhood—some form of extramarital sex relationship and parenthood.

Why is it that it never occurs to these reformers that it might be well to try seriously to put into operation the age-long social code of the Christian church? The teaching of the church has always been clear and distinct on this subject of sexual morality: chastity until marriage and fidelity after marriage. Christian moralists have always insisted that a life of continence was perfectly possible both for men and women who for one reason or another have not married. It may not be so easy for those who are not Christians, and therefore have not the privilege of receiving the manifold gifts of the Holy Spirit through the sacraments; but it would be foolish to deny that continence is possible for anyone, whatever his religion may be. Through vast numbers of men and women vowed to chastity in the religious life, as well as through celibate priests, the church is constantly proclaiming to the world that sexual continence is possible for human nature. If chastity until marriage were the general rule both for young men and for young women, it would materially increase marital happiness and devotion afterwards, it would obliterate venereal disease in a few generations, and it would make for healthier and happier children.

As for the church's teaching as to the duty of fidelity after marriage it could not be better expressed than in one of the resolutions of the last Lambeth conference:

The Conference affirms as our Lord's principle and standard of marriage a life-long and indissoluble union, for better for worse, of one man with one woman, to the exclusion of all others on either side, and calls on all Christian people to maintain and bear witness to this standard.

The bishops are also clear and outspoken as to the spread in our modern society of theories and practices that are hostile to the family ideal. It is unfortunate that the nature of the subject is such that we cannot have equally plain speaking from our pulpits on these grave matters. In Resolution No. 68 the bishops speak thus:

We utter an emphatic warning against the use of unnatural means for the avoidance of conception, together with the grave dangers—physical, moral, and religious—thereby incurred, and against the evils with which the extension of such use threatens the race. In opposition to the teaching which, under the name of science and religion, encourages married people in the deliberate cultivation of sexual union as an end in itself, we steadfastly uphold what must always be regarded as the governing considerations of Christian marriage. One is the primary purpose for which marriage exists, namely the continuation of the race through the gift and heritage of children; the other is the paramount importance in married life of deliberate and thoughtful self-control.

It is a high ideal no doubt that the church sets before the world. But then the church is the body of Christ, and is necessarily concerned with proclaiming the truth of God and not the inventions of men. All the finest and choicest things in life demand sacrifice from those who would possess them. If we are to have pure and holy homes, happy and healthy children, devoted and inspiring mothers, and strong, manly fathers, it can be only at the price of stern and rigorous self-denial, both before and after marriage.

The Association for Sanctity of Marriage

WE welcome the formation of the Association for the Sanctity of Marriage and are glad to have it make use of our columns. What stronger indictment of the rottenness of modern society can be framed, or what more urgent call to all Christians to unite against the world, the flesh, and the devil can be made, than are to be found daily in the news columns of our papers, with their constant reports of divorce and remarriage? The divorcé and the divorcée are no longer under a social cloud—happy is the man who does not have to number some such among the circle of his relatives! The “best people” are foremost in this matter. A straw which attests the strong current is the fact that the most widely circulated weekly in America, which has scrupulously maintained a “family” standard, has lately published three stories where the escape from the usual tangle and the necessary “happy ending” are provided by divorce. A young Englishwoman, testifying before a grave committee of Parliament, recently expressed the doubt whether, on the whole, chastity is the best preparation for marriage and parenthood. Any lawyer will give his opinion, derived from observation, of the real value of the exception in our canon, regarding the “innocent party.” No doubt the uncertain sound of the declaration of the Lambeth conference on marriage was chiefly due to our bishops being compromised by our canon. The more shame to us.

Limitations at Lambeth

WE have been reading with care the full report of the Lambeth Conference, and we are struck with its Anglican character. That was not so evident in the Encyclical

Letter, but it is written all over the reports and resolutions. The chairman of every committee was an Englishman, unless one excepts the Archbishop of Capetown and the Bishop of Calcutta. It is natural, therefore, that problems are envisaged as they present themselves to Englishmen, that the solutions proposed are those that approve themselves to an English mind, and that the authorities quoted are practically all Englishmen. It is thus that one must account for the extraordinary position taken with regard to the diaconate for women. Certainly our American women have long been active and influential in all church affairs, but they are a long way from demanding a share in the responsibilities of the ministry. We suspect Miss Maude Royden loomed large in the eyes of those who voted for this resolution. There are many traces of the same sort of limited outlook. We are of the opinion that the Catholic church, and under it the American church—not the Roman nor the Anglican—are the best guides for American Christians.

Bolshevist Asceticism

WE have been getting of late much clearer light on the aims, methods, and personalities of Lenine, Trotsky, Zinovieff, Lunacharsky and other leaders of the Russian revolution. All observers, however they differ otherwise, seem to agree on the fanatical sincerity of these men and their willingness to go all lengths to attain their ends. We are told repeatedly that Bolshevism is more of a religion than an economic theory, and that its adherents give themselves to its practice and propaganda with the wholehearted

bigotry of devotees. Mr. Wells pictures them as almost Puritan in personal ascetism. Mrs. Sheridan, cousin of the English Winston Churchill, widow of a British officer, shudders at their atheism, and is keenly conscious of their futilities and absurdities, but contrasts their hard work, austere lives, and burning zeal with the idleness, self-indulgence, and pleasure seeking of so many elsewhere. It is not a matter of political sympathy or even of liking for the Russian temperament. It is the involuntary tribute all men pay to reality of conviction and consistency of conduct.

It has its rebuke and its lesson for members of the Christian church. If we are to win the world we must once more put the Cross in the forefront. A comfortable, easy-going religion will have only comfortable, easy-going followers. They tell us that the Bolsheviki are less than one per cent of the population, but they rule Russia because they know what they want and are determined to get it. We fancy that when Christians were but a small part of the Roman world they were more nearly a controlling force than they are today. The real trouble with us Episcopalians is an apparent lack of conviction, softness, tolerance of half-conversion, timidity of speech and action. The wealth, culture, respectability and avoidance of unseemly extremes of which we are proud, are the silken fetters which hamper progress. We need, not so much, social reformers, well-manned bureaus, better plants, educational systems—excellent as all these may be—but reckless adventurers for God, enthusiasts, wild dreamers, madmen, like that inspired tentmaker who counted all things but loss that so he might attain Christ. That is why he and other apostolic leaders were charged with turning the world upside down.

Communication With the Departed'

REV. WILLIAM HARMAN VAN ALLEN, S.T.D.

IN such a symposium as this, where no special marking out of the subject has been agreed upon, there will be overlapping, unavoidably. But since each contributor's own independent conclusion is the thing desired, such overlapping can be tolerated. I write, of course, with no advance knowledge of what the other priests and laymen will say on our common theme.

First, I note that the topic is "Communication With the Departed," not "Communion." Our *communion* with all saints, here and beyond, is a blessed certainty, in which we as Christians rejoice daily. No materialist can believe in the possibility of either; but Christians are agreed in confessing the survival of the human spirit after death, the existence of other, non-human, spirits, both good and bad, and a necessary series of inter-relations between life in this world of sense and life on the spiritual plane. Accepting Holy Scripture, we acknowledge that God is Lord of all His creatures, and that all live unto Him; nay more, we explicitly confess that He has often drawn back the veil to allow the departed to communicate with the living. Most ethnic religions believe in life after death, and hold to the possibility of manifestations of that life to those who remain here. I take it that our question, however, involves the initiation of such communications from this side, the deliberate evocation of spirits into our plane.

1. Is it possible to do this?
2. Has such communication so initiated, ever been established?
3. Is it desirable to attempt such communication?

¹Read at the Church Congress, Rochester, December 7, 1920.

The whole matter is of particular interest now-a-days: largely because of the terrific bereavements the Great War has brought, but further, because certain scientific and literary men of good repute, having undertaken to investigate phenomena in this field, are convinced that disembodied intelligences, (identified by name as human beings) have actually "got through" to those they left on earth. This wave of "psychical research" is variously regarded. In a Boston Lowell lecture of December 1, 1920, Prof. Raymond Pearl, of Johns Hopkins University, said: "The other consequence of science's present inability to lay bare, in final and irrefragible terms, the truth about the course, if any, of events subsequent to death is more serious. It opens the way for recurring mental epidemics of that intimate mixture of hyper-credulity and hyper-knavery, which used to be called Spiritualism, but now prefers more seductive titles. We are at the moment in the midst of perhaps the most violent and destructive epidemic of this sort which has ever occurred. Its evil lies in the fact that in exact proportion to the virulence it destroys the confidence of the collective mind of humanity in the enduring efficacy of the only thing which the history of mankind has demonstrated to contribute to the advancement of man's intellectual, physical, spiritual, and moral well-being, namely, that orderly progression of ascertained knowledge which we call science."

Other scientific men of even higher standing array themselves in opposition to this uncompromising denunciation. We are told that the phenomena of spirit-communication have given sight in place of faith, and that Christians should rejoice in all this corroboration of their belief. We are also told of shattered nerves, ruined health, moral collapse, and insanity, all as consequences of such experiments.

Medium after medium is exposed as fraudulent, only to have other mediums arise, of whose integrity everyone must be satisfied. "Messages" multiply, yet the sum total is trivial, contradictory, or trite. What shall be our attitude towards the whole problem?

First, we note that, despite advertisements of "a new revelation," there is not one new phenomenon. Mediumship, automatic writing, trances, materializations, all are found among primitive peoples today and are recorded in ancient histories. Conan Doyle quotes a judge in India as "finding among the Indian fakirs every phenomenon of advanced European mediumship, everything which Home had done. The fakirs said that they were done by the Pitris or spirits, and that the only difference in their procedure from ours seemed to be that they made more use of direct evocation. They claimed that these powers were handed down from time immemorial." The only new thing is that many scientists are now taking these phenomena seriously as worthy investigation, and are perhaps unaware how long mankind has known them.

Nor can this long record of necromancy among primitive people be adduced as having justified the practice by leading them nearer to God our Father. Witchcraft, the worship of devils, and a religion of fear have been its results unvaryingly, as any student of Gentile religions will affirm. And if the antiquity of the practice be offered as proof of its value, let it be remembered that there is a great difference between the treasures of the past and the kitchen-middens.

Second, much of what is offered as from the other world can be sufficiently explained by attributing it to psychic powers and faculties recognized but not yet brought under general laws. Clairvoyance, clairsaudience, telepathy, ap-

paritions of the living: all these, though super-normal, have no necessary connection with the life beyond. Only a blind materialist altogether denies these phenomena; and they receive a continually increasing studious attention. But we may rule these out of this discussion, once they are so classified.

Third, extraordinary care in observation must be used, because of the opportunities for trickery. Every "materializing" phenomenon has been duplicated by jugglers; and that remarkable book, "The Road to En-Dor," tells how two young British officers in a Turkish prison-camp, reading Sir Oliver Lodge's "Raymond," reproduced all the characteristic "tests" which satisfied him, and found, to their amazement, that they had succeeded in deceiving their fellows and even the Turkish Commandant. I note with interest that the reason they give for publishing the whole story is their hope to save bereaved parents from seeking comfort in the grossly carnal regions offered today as Elysian fields of spirit.

The temptation to fraud is very great in this whole field; and one is not surprised that many students, disgusted at what they have found, declare impatiently that it is all imposture. Nor can any one scientist's declaration suffice as evidence, since scientific men out of their own province are as easily deluded as anyone else. I shall not forget the world-famous professor of chemistry, at one of our greatest universities, to whom I pointed out the phosphorus fuming unmistakably in connection with some "materializations" in his own house. "No," said he, "it isn't phosphorus, though it looks like it and smells like it. I've handled more phosphorus than any other man in America, and this is a mysterious spirit-substance used in materializing." Prof.

Crawford's tragic case will be remembered of late in the same connection.

But, ruling out clairvoyance, telepathy, and tricks, does anything remain? I had only just left the University thirty years ago, when a priest whom I loved and honored laid upon me the task of investigating that problem. "If I tell people that 'spiritualism,' so-called, is nothing but fraud, and they later come upon manifestations which are genuinely psychic, they will be ready to accept it all on its face value," said he. For years, therefore, I devoted much of my leisure to study and experiment in this field; I was a member of the old Society for Psychical Research; and my interest has never flagged to this day.

I am clear that, after making all allowances, there is a residuum of genuine phenomena having to do with actual messages from the spiritual world. I believe that it is possible to initiate such communication through the methods already named: the use of so-called "mediums," and of devices for automatic writing, or the inducing of some form of trance. I have been the agent for receiving such messages myself, under conditions which, I think, absolutely precluded fraud; and I am satisfied that such communications are far from uncommon.

But that is not all. Granted that this conclusion is warrantable, vulgar materialism is at once over-thrown, irrespective of the character and source of those messages,—that is, whether they came from discarnate intelligences of a non-human class, or from human beings living on after death in the spiritual world: and whether they are true in substance, or false, from good or bad spirits. So much is satisfactory: life is shown as not necessarily associated with physical bodies, and the existence of a spiritual world, peopled by intelligent personalities, is demonstrated.

Yet we can not rest here. The Bostonian who gets into wireless touch with New York has not accomplished all his desire; he must reach the friend he wants, nor be content if he finds himself linked up with any casual Manhattanese. Tammany Hall and our Diocesan House are not identical, nor equivalent.

I have already reminded you that in the spiritual world there are angels as well as human spirits; that there are good and bad angels, even as there are good and bad men. This teaching, though clearly set forth in the Bible, and appearing in many Gentile religions, is repudiated by some to-day, solely on obscurantist grounds of prejudice. My friend Professor Hyslop, e.g., explicitly denied the existence of any non-human spirits. Why it should be "superstitious" to believe in angels, and even more "superstitious" to believe in fallen angels, is not easy to understand; and I prefer to hold fast by the Word of God. Relying upon that, I find that the chief activity of fallen angels, or demons, is the attempt to deceive mankind; and that all the phenomena of mediumship may appear in connection with that attempt. Necromancy, or the endeavor to communicate with the dead, was known and forbidden under the Mosaic Law. Some superficial person may suggest that this prohibition has passed away with the ceremonial requirements of that code. But this is moral and religious, not ceremonial; and the prophets are as clear. Witness Isaiah viii., 19-20:

"And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto the wizards, that chirp and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? On behalf of the living should they seek unto the dead? To the law and to the testimony! Surely according to this word shall they speak for whom there is no morning."

No repeal of this prohibition appears in the New Testament; and our Lord and His apostles deal peremptorily with "controls," with never a word of encouragement for those who would invite such visitations, or would seek knowledge from such sources. I need scarcely remind you that Christ absolutely refused to receive tributes from the spirits possessing those unfortunate "mediums" of His day, nor intimated that truth could be learned from them. And the Christian Church from its beginning has followed that same policy. Never denying the possibility of such communications, she has written above the entrance to the witch's cave, "Dangerous Passing."

So, forewarned by the experience of countless generations, we approach these messages with suspicion, prepared to "try the spirits:" and at once we find our suspicion justified, both positively and negatively, and with regard to the effect upon the transmitter and the recipient alike. Take the great mass of recorded communications to which attention has been drawn these last few years; and you will find it lacking in novelty, originality, dignity, ethical uplift, or religious inspiration. The best of it, as Father Longridge says of Stainton Moses' books, is second-rate sermon-stuff, worn threadbare. And out of the rest, not one fact, not one truth, not one new discovery, enriches us; but instead, wearisome trifles degenerating over and over into profanity, blasphemy and obscenity, and shot through and through with contradictions and falsehoods.

Here note what two famous students have said:

"If we had no other evidence than automatic writing, we might conclude that the manufacture of puzzles and enigmas is the sole faculty and employment of discarnate spirits." (Professor Sir Wm. Barrett.)

Hereward Carrington, reporting to the S. P. R. on his experiments with Mrs. Piper, says, "I gained the distinct impression throughout the sittings that instead of the spirits of the personages who claimed to be present, I was dealing with an exceedingly sly, cunning, tricky, and deceitful intelligence, which threw out chance remarks, fishing guesses and shrewd inferences, leaving the sitter to pick these up and elaborate them if he would. If anything could make me believe in the doctrine of evil and lying spirits, it would the sittings with Mrs. Piper."

It is sometimes alleged that the trashiness of messages must be excused on the ground of the great difficulty the spirits have in "getting through." But surely, *once the connection is made*, it is as easy to communicate sense as nonsense. I need not labor that point.

The appeal of modern necromancy is strongest to those who have suffered bereavement, and who lack the blessed reassurance of the Christian faith. Idle curiosity has its part in stimulating dangerous experimentation: and there are a few scientific persons who "take all knowledge to their province," and are determined to investigate *omne scibile*. Such are not the people who buy "Raymond" and flock to the newest medium, or waste hours over "Ouija." A mother has lost her only son in the war: if only she could be positively assured that he lives still, loves her, knows her love, and can tell her so! A nominal Christian, she has been habituated to the thought of Christianity as a decent ethical system associated with a long-dead Jewish teacher, and to be translated chiefly into terms of private conduct and sociology. Sunday mornings she had heard Confucius and Buddha discussed, or else has joined in the observance of Anti-Tuberculosis Day, or Sanitation Sunday, or the imme-

diately pressing "drive" for the Community Centre. That "Jesus and the Resurrection" is the essence of the Gospel, she has never learned: in the presence of earlier sorrows, a moderate Stoicism has been urged upon her, with the assurance that time will bring forgetfulness. Of the Communion of Saints in sacraments and prayers she knows nothing: she has never besought the King unto Whom all live that rest eternal and perpetual light may be the portion of her dear ones, nor joined in offering the Holy Sacrifice for the departed as for those who are still in their pilgrimage,— "all God's whole Church"; she has never called upon Blessed Mary and all Saints to pray for them that await their perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, nor comforted herself with the sweet assurance that the Waiting Church, in that place and state of purgation where no other work of charity is possible, still sends up its prayers for those of us in the Church Militant on earth. A grave in France, to be cared for piously; a name on the Honor-Roll; a golden star; and a vague "Perhaps": that is all she has.

Now comes Sir Oliver Lodge, or some other prophet of this "New Revelation," assuring her that, under right conditions, she can receive late news of her son. Perhaps he will spell out words on the ouija, or whisper through the trumpet, or guide the hand that touches the planchette. He may bid a savage child lisp fragments, like "Feda" or "Bright Eyes"; wonder of wonders! he may animate a table that shall try to climb up into her lap, as proof of love's abidingness. Nay, more, he may tell her of the phantom cigarettes and whiskies-and-sodas that minister to his spirituous needs on the higher plane where he now dwells. What surprise that she clutches eagerly at this blessed gift, and is ready to be convinced by every tenuous evidence of his identity?

Now this question of identity is vital. I ignore the vast amount of commonplace that might serve to identify one spirit as well as another: I suggest in passing the well-known fact that, without intending to do so, the questioner will very often give information which, *embodied in the replies*, will seem new and conclusive. And I urge these considerations:

1. Almost all that comes from a medium is the reproduction of knowledge already in the conscious or subconscious mind of the questioner.

2. Where prearranged attempts have been made before death to identify a returning spirit, they have failed ignominiously.

3. If any further matter capable of attestation is proffered, we need to remember that Conan Doyle himself acknowledges, "there are direct impersonations"; and that "deluding spirits" are explicitly referred to in Holy Scripture.

Bearing these points in mind, I am prepared to maintain that no absolute proof of personal identity has ever been given through mediums; and that apparent proofs, if the séances be long continued, are likely to evaporate.

Let me submit two cases in point, all the more weighty because from men who accept, in the main, the value of necromancy.

The first is in Sir Oliver Lodge's book, "The Survival of Men," published in 1909.

Frederick Myers, before he died, wrote a message, sealed it in an envelope, and handed it to Lodge, its contents being known only to the writer. Myers hoped that after death he might identify himself by revealing through a medium the substance of what was contained therein. The letter was

placed in a Birmingham bank. After Myers' death, messages began to come, as was alleged, from him; and at last the promised revelation was recorded. In 1904, the Council of the S. P. R. being present, the sealed envelope was opened; and its contents had no resemblance whatever to what the messages had set forth.

Someone questions: "Would you have acknowledged that Myers had come back if the medium had actually given the correct contents of the envelope?" Not of necessity: I should be bound to consider other possible explanations, such as clairvoyance, or what James calls "the cosmic reservoir." But here is abject failure and the attempt to pass off a substitute. If a yogi offers to make a clay pigeon fly, and it doesn't, I need not waste time over the various opportunities of substitution he might perhaps have used to feign success in his own attempt.

The second is reported by Dr. J. G. Raupert from Dr. I. K. Funk. Dr. Funk was absolutely confident that he had established the identity of a certain spirit as that of his deceased wife. She communicated with him through all the mediums he visited, proved her identity by certain signs agreed upon, and spoke intimately of the most private affairs of her supposed past life. A year or so later, he visited a medium who could not possibly know him, and who had most certainly never seen him before. His spirit-wife gave the usual sign of identification, continuing a conversation which had been broken off elsewhere. In the course of this conversation, she had occasion to refer to her death, but in a manner which startled him, and, for the first time, aroused his suspicion. He enquired cautiously, "Tell me again, under what circumstances did you leave your body?" She replied, "Why this question? you surely know," and

then she proceeded to describe what she claimed to be the manner of her death, but what in reality corresponded to that of his deceased mother, his wife having died in an entirely different manner, and from quite a different complaint. The masquerading spirit had "tapped" the subconscious mind of Dr. Funk, but had, in the manipulation of the phantasm secured, made a most startling mistake.

My own experiments with communications by automatic writing have followed uniformly a certain course. A relation being established, the automatic writing gave a name (usually of some dead person known to me or to one present) verified his identity by adducing dates, events, and other names, and went on to answer questions lucidly, intelligently, and truthfully. After a time, errors in fact appeared. Being challenged, either further answers were refused, or the answers became more and more demonstrably untruthful. If I persevered, a new name, apparently non-human, was given, and the end was either gibberish or foul profanity and obscenity.

What is the source of such communications, if we repudiate whole-heartedly their coming from the souls of the blessed dead? I am not ashamed to echo St. Thomas Aquinas: "Demons pretend to be the souls of the dead, and confirm in their error heathen who believe this."

Let me go further, and put myself here wholly at one on this point with the wise and practical judgment of the great Roman Catholic Church. Emphasizing, more than some other Christian bodies, the fact of the Communion of Saints, and not afraid to record ten thousand *unsought* visions and revelations made to the faithful (as matters of pious belief though not *de fide*) she has never failed to warn her children against those foul fiends of which our Lord and His

Word tells us,—but which make matters of thorn-crackling mirth for too many half-taught Christians of our day. “Satan is never so busy as when he is whispering into the ears of men that he does not exist.”

Some for whom the Angelical Doctor is no authority may take Sir William Barrett, the ex-President of the S. P. R., more seriously: “Those practices (necromancy) tended to obscure the divine idea, and to weaken the supreme faith in, and reverent worship of the One Omnipotent Being. Instead of the Arm of the Lord beyond and above them, a motley crowd of pious, lying, vain or gibbering spirits would seem to people the unseen; and weariness, perplexity, and finally despair, would enervate and destroy the nation. The same peril exists today, and through all time will continue to exist.”

It is recorded of Stainton Moses that “during one period of his mediumship evil spirits assailed him, his days were perturbation, and his nights were terror. Every sense was assailed. The foulest stench spread through his bedroom. Often and often he thought his guides were devils from hell.”

I wonder why the heralds of our modern necromancy maintain silence about the scores of cases like this, and give the impression that all is sweet and innocent in connection with their sorceries. It seems disingenuous; it is certainly unscientific.

Some years ago, a woman of my congregation reported to me that she was finding great comfort in messages from her dead father. I warned her, and finally (as was my duty) excommunicated her. She came back later, penitent and terrified. “I did not know what it all meant at first, it seemed so innocent; but since then I have looked through

the open doors of hell itself," she said. Spirits which lie, delight in deception, make false claims, and rejoice in filthiness, if they be human, must be lost souls indeed.

I quote from Stainton Moses once more: "Some spirits will assent to leading questions, and, possessed apparently with the desire to please, or unconscious of the import of what they say, or without moral consciousness, will say anything. Such motiveless lying bespeaks a deeply evil nature. Such an impostor, acting with an air of sincerity, must be as 'Satan clothed in light.' "

But the other explanation seems far easier to accept. When Prof. Hyslop assured me that the spirit possessing a hysterical child was no other than that of Count Cagliostro, and proved it by the fact that it gave the correct pronunciation of his family name as Balsamo, instead of Balsámo, as Hyslop had always called it, I showed him Balsamo given in the Standard Dictionary. And when he told me of "reading the riot act" (the phrase is his own) to Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy, who came back in the winter of 1918-1919 to torment one of her disciples with whom she had quarrelled, but, under pressure, promised him she would return whence she came, it was difficult to be civilly sober-faced. Perhaps the most notable of all controls, was "Dr. Phinuit" claiming to be a French physician, and speaking through Mrs. Piper. Not one statement made as to his life on earth was true; nor could he ever explain his complete ignorance of French. Mrs. Piper, herself, has held that all the phenomena associated with herself are rather those of thought-transference than of any spirit-communication.

A word more as to the nature of these spirits. When we sing "At the sign of triumph Satan's host doth flee" it is not a mere rhetorical trope. Over and over I have known

table-tipping and automatic writing stopped by the sign of the cross; and Dr. Morgan Dix told me years ago how he utterly broke up Mr. Dale-Owen's attempt to reproduce necromantic marvels in Mrs. General Dix's library (some time in the '60's) by reciting silently, in the back of the room, the ancient office of exorcization.

But there are not a few today who would be eager to talk with the Archfiend himself if they could satisfy their curiosity, gain a new thrill, or (as they would say) add to the fund of knowledge. Let us ask, then, what are the results of these practices, and what is the value of the information derived from them?

I had the privilege of ministering for some years to one of the most learned and heavenly-minded of our clergy, who found it necessary to put himself in restraint because of a constantly repeated urgent suggestion from an invisible mentor that he should kill his much loved wife, or, failing that, kill himself. His mind was clear and strong; his recreation during those years was to make a new and successful translation of Dante, and he had no doubt whatever of the source of this suggestion. How often experimentation in forbidden fields has led to suicide, murder or mania, let the records show.

Long continued mediumship is almost certain to ruin the mental powers of the sensitive. The very large proportion of professional mediums who used narcotics was one of the first things my own researches showed me. (Prohibition may have somewhat helped that situation.) "I have observed the steady downward course of all mediums who sit regularly," says Sir William Barrett. Mrs. Piper has told me of her bitter grief that she had to suffer such invasions and of her relief when, after her reception of the

sacraments at the hands of an English priest, they ceased.

And reliance upon the guidance of the spirits has so often resulted in catastrophes, moral, domestic or financial, that I do not need to particularize here. The daily papers give evidence on that.

Grant that if, through psychic phenomena, a materialist comes to believe in the existence of spiritual forces, he has advanced intellectually towards a fuller knowledge of the truth: that does not justify us in having recourse to such to fortify *our* faith. *Non tali auxilio*. If God grant glimpses of the unseen world, let us rejoice in them, as did St. Martin, concerning whom his disciple and biographer, Sulpicius Severus, records that he and another watched for two hours outside St. Martin's cell, hearing the murmur of conversation, and adread. When Martin appeared they questioned him. "Agnes, and Thecla, and Mary have been with me. But tell no one." He confessed he was often visited by them, and described their appearance: nor did he deny that he had often seen the Apostles Peter and Paul.

But this same Martin had also in his cell a visitor of another sort: mild, majestic, benign, all-glorious, crowned and robed in splendor. "Who art thou?" he questioned. "I am thy Lord, Martin, worship me." "Nay, my Lord Jesus bears the marks of the wounds," the saint replied, and the foul fiend fled away from the sacred Name.

That little children have seen their guardian angels, I believe. I have stood by death-beds where dying eyes opened wide in joyful recognition of old friends gathered round to welcome. The spiritual world is all about us, filled with God's creatures, good and bad; and it is no empty liturgic phrase which we sing before the coming of Jesus to His altar-throne: "With angels and archangels, and with

all the company of Heaven"; or confess on Michaelmas "the services of angels and men in a wonderful order." But the secrets of that world belong to Him, and I dare not peep through the keyhole nor strive to force an entrance at which I may eavesdrop.

As to the substance of all that has come to the world from such spirits, a well-known Englishwoman, an author, has justly said: "All that claims to come from the minds of discarnate spirits is on a lower level of thought, insight, and literary achievement than what is produced on earth." I make Miss Dougal's statement my own and challenge disproof. If we were to judge of the other world solely by these products, taken seriously, deterioration would be its outstanding note, and we might well desire extinction rather than such an immortality. Consider the one item of descriptions of the life beyond: if a high-school boy visiting a new country could not send home more interesting letters than those purporting to come from great minds within the veil he would be accounted a moron. And yet details are not lacking: there is no reverent reserve, like the Apostle's, "which it is not lawful for a man to utter." Even so, despite Conan Doyle's positive declaration, there are frightful incongruities and contradictions vitiating all.

This brings me to the religious character of "the New Revelation," and, since its prophets stress this most, I regret I have not more time to deal with it.

I am a Christian priest, speaking to believing Christian people. I am sworn to teach the Faith once for all delivered to the Saints; I am warned that if I, or an angel professing to be from God, set forth another Gospel, both he and I are to be held accursed. We have been assured in Holy Scripture (I Tim. iv. 2) that in the latter days "some shall fall

away from the Faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons," and we are bidden hold fast the profession of our Faith without wavering. Reminding ourselves of this, we inspect the religious teachings associated with these manifestations, and we find a progressive rejection of the whole Christian religion. In so far as "Spiritualism," organized, has a voice, it denies God altogether, and shows us a world peopled and ruled by "the spirits." not by God, our Creator and Father. Where this denial is not avowed, we find the Incarnation repudiated, our Divine Lord and Saviour held as a superior kind of medium, His Church mocked at, His sacraments repudiated, prayer ignored, and the things of sense substituted for the things of the real spirit. "One never gets any spiritual ideas out of Spiritualism," Baron von Hügel has well said. We "try the spirits," as the Apostle bids, by their attitude towards the Incarnation: and because of what that shows we utterly disclaim any part in the anti-Christian system which is offered us in the place of the religion of Jesus Christ, the Lord of all, "the One Faith, the True Faith," the Universal Religion of the Universal Man.

How far this blight, which has renewed its spread so rapidly of late, is due to the criminal silence of Christian teachers, one hardly dares to conjecture. Doctor McComb, in his "Future Life," speaking of the confidence which has come through spirit communication, says: "Were one to stand up in a Christian pulpit and proclaim a future life with a like assurance he would be listened to with polite incredulity on the part of very many, and would find himself regarded as something of an enthusiast. The average churchgoer resents the unqualified affirmation of a life beyond the grave." Doctor McComb, doubtless, speaks out

of his experience: mine, thank God, is different. But it is plainly our duty to roll away this reproach, to which the neglect of certain Christian verities has exposed many. One Lord lives and reigns today: we worship a living Saviour, Who was dead and is alive again: in Him we invoke all Saints: we "pray as for the living, for the dead, each day"; at the altar we are *one*, where heaven meets earth. We, who keep Easter, need not to reinforce our faith in eternal life by what the ouija can tell us. He Who is the Resurrection and the Life illumines our intellects, purifies our hearts, strengthens our wills, assuages our sorrows, by the sunshine of His presence.

Let men of careful scientific training investigate psychic phenomena of every character and report to us their conclusions: that is their task, never to be attempted by persons unqualified except at a fearful risk. But when our heads are bowed with personal sorrow we have a surer consolation than any which science can afford: nor need we steal into darkened chambers, listening to whispering oracles or unvouched-for intruders. One Who is omnipotent speaks to us: "He that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live." And we respond humbly, joyously, confidently: "Lord, I believe: help Thou mine unbelief."

The Silence of Jesus Christ¹

CHARLES C. MARSHALL

WHEN the Jews asked the Son of God if it were lawful to give tribute to Caesar, the relation of things spiritual to things material was definitely presented. The image and superscription of the tribute money represented all that "Caesar" stood for and implied. Touching it all Jesus Christ was silent. They were told to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's.

If it is urged that by reason of limitations in the human nature of Jesus the significance of "Caesar," the knowledge of the future and of historic cause and effect were all beyond His consciousness, it is readily shown that the same silence touching another matter of similar import is found in the episode of the woman taken in adultery. No theories can cloud the fact that Jesus knew what any intelligent Jew knew—the Jewish law of marriage and divorce; and we know that He taught the sacredness of the marriage relation—that distinctly Jewish contribution to ancient life and the foundation of the moral code of the embryo

¹ Three books that have lately come before the public are frequently referred to and quoted in this article:

The History of Freedom and Other Essays, by Lord Acton. Macmillan and Company, 1919.

The Idea of Progress, The Romanes Lectures of 1920, by W. R. Inge, D.D. (Dean of St. Paul's). Oxford Clarendon Press.

The Idea of Progress, An Inquiry into its Origin and Growth, by J. B. Bury, Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. Macmillan and Company, 1920.

If some of the historical conclusions of Lord Acton are now questioned they are not disproved and he still remains the most just and discriminating apologist of the Roman Catholic Church. Dean Inge and Professor Bury while already the center of a storm of angry protest have not yet, at least, been disturbed in their conclusions by their critics.

church. When the scribes brought the woman taken in adultery, Jesus stooped down and with His finger wrote on the ground as though he heard them not. He frustrated the enforcement of the law as a civil ordinance, by suggesting that he that was without sin should cast the first stone, and revealed the sole purpose of the Incarnation in the words: "Go and sin no more." He was silent as to the law as an institution of the state and the framework of secular life. Sin in the individual life was His object of attack and the holiness of that life His only mission. The state and society were not His province, but the soul of the woman.

The Jews came to tell Jesus of the Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices, and the answer was: "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish." The event in its social and political aspect was regarded with silence although it was an opportunity for a discourse on the justification of revolution or on some "cosmic" principle like self-determination for all nations, great or small.

The destruction of Jerusalem by a Roman Emperor was foretold—not one stone was to be left upon another—an event analogous to the bombardment of Rheims or the spoliation of Belgium, but it passed without a word touching the wrongs of the oppressed or the crimes of the oppressor. "Oh Jerusalem, if thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace."

Socialism presented itself before Him, when one of the company said unto Him: "Master, speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me," and His reply was: "Who made me a judge or a divider over you?" and then came the silence.

The silence that modernism attributes to the ignorance of a Jewish carpenter, Catholic faith will still insist in re-

garding as the silence of the omniscient Son of God. Faith may find in that silence justification for a certain indifference toward political and secular manifestations and a certain suspicion of the Church of Christ when it permits them to take possession of her.

Current events permit the inference that the alleged synthesis in historic development between the so-called "world-renouncing ethic" of Jesus and the "world-embracing ethic" of the secularized church is something of a failure. Indeed it may be that what has been thought a synthesis of development was a miscarriage of error. There is much to support the opinion of Huxley in favor of miscarriage as nearer right than that of Harnack and Kirsopp Lake. Huxley wrote in 1889:

The church founded by Jesus has not made its way, has not permeated the world, but did become extinct in the country of its birth as Nazarenism and Ebionism. The church that made its way and coalesced with the state in the fourth century had no more to do with the church founded by Jesus than Ultramontaniam has with Quakerism. It is Alexandrian Judaism and neo-platonistic mystagogy and as much of the old idolatry and demonology as could be got it under new or old names.¹

That sounds more like a miscarriage than a synthesis. The Church did not become extinct. Professor Huxley suffered from a hopeless spiritual myopia, but with due allowance for that his words well express the deflection of Christianity.

A gentler spirit than his² has written just as trenchantly:

¹ Life and Letters of Thomas H. Huxley, Vol. II, p. 243.

² Amiel's Journal, Vol. II, p. 215.

The Christian nations offer many illustrations of the law of irony. They profess the citizenship of heaven, the exclusive worship of eternal good; and never has the hungry pursuit of perishable joys, the love of this world or the thirst for conquest been stronger or more active than among these nations. Their official motto is exactly the reverse of their real aspiration. Under a false flag they play the smuggler with a droll ease of conscience. Is the fraud a conscious one? No—it is but the application of the law of irony. The deception is so common a one that the delinquent becomes unconscious of it. Every nation gives itself the lie in the course of its daily life and not one feels the ridicule of its position. A man must be a Japanese to perceive the burlesque contradictions of Christian civilization.

The consideration of the question here undertaken is wholly subject to limitations confessedly Christian, and will doubtless seem to many as naive as it is admitted to be reactionary.

However significant of progress our epoch, and however essential its political and social development may seem to the further progress of Christianity, it does not present an aspect differing in these respects from that of the Roman Empire at the beginning of the Christian era. At that time a world unified in the Empire, racial lines obliterated in Roman citizenship, national hatreds expiring under Roman polity, the universality of the Latin tongue, the intercommunication by Roman roads, and all that vast material civilization and achievement which characterized the Empire, seemed to open the way for the spread of Christianity and to presage a vast forward movement significant of continuous progress. The intense interest and expectation that pervades human life today is but the continuation or revival of that "unparalleled intellectual excitement which followed the presence on earth of Jesus of Nazareth."¹ It

¹ Acton.

may be said that the baptism of Constantine appeared at the time to be as directly connected with Christian progress as the League of Nations and universal suffrage are said to be now, but the question is: Are any such events of any importance whatever from the standpoint of the essential religion of Jesus Christ?

From that standpoint the baptism of Constantine was important if a human soul was saved, but as the baptism of an Emperor it was of no importance whatever.¹ From that standpoint the League of Nations, were it an outgrowth of the conversion of souls, would be important. As a substitute for religious ideas and a prop to anti-Christ it is of no more importance than the imperial baptism.²

For two thousand years the church has moved along with the state in the monarchical and oligarchical development. It now moves with the democratic development. The lesson learned from the past if applied now would save the church from the disaster that impends. The church while independent in theory and inception has always after brief struggles coalesced with and then been absorbed by the political sovereignty, which—as Father Figgis has said—is the same thing under different names: “The great Levia-

¹“Very soon after the time of Constantine it began to appear that the outward conversion of the Empire was a boon of doubtful value to religion.”—“Political Thoughts on the Church,” Acton.

“In the fervent age of its conversion the Empire employed its refined civilization, the accumulated wisdom of ancient sages, the reasonableness and subtlety of Roman Law, and the entire inheritance of the Jewish, the Pagan and the Christian World to make the Church serve as the gilded crutch of absolutism.”—“Freedom in Christianity,” Acton.

³“As the theory of the balance of power was adopted in Europe as a substitute for the influence of religious ideas incorporated in the power of the Popes, so now, political zeal occupies the place made vacant by the decline of religious fervour and commands to an almost equal extent the enthusiasm of men.”—“Political Thoughts on the Church,” The same. 1858.

than of Hobbes, the *plenitudo potestatis* of the Canonists, the *arcana imperii*, the Sovereignty of Austin"¹—to which I may add the divine right of kings and the divine right of majorities.

It is the commonplace of history that where the church may be said to have established a society distinct from the state as in the ascendancy at times of the church over the emperor and in that independence of political sovereignty which came ultimately to the religious sovereignty or temporal power of the popes, the church became herself the incarnation of political power and of secular and material interests. The things of Caesar absorbed the things of God whether under the name of Civilization, Patriotism, Legitimism, Nationalism, Equality, Liberty, Philanthropy or some other of the Shibboleths of Progress.

The transformation went on in the Christian Society under the primacy of the Bishop of Rome from the point of original purity—where, her learned apologist says, it was "the great object of the Church by keeping the two spheres permanently distinct—by rendering to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's—to make all absolutism of whatever kind impossible"—to the consummation of absolutism in the decree of infallibility in 1870 by the Vatican Council, which the same apologist, grimly accepting as authoritative, stigmatized as "neither legitimate in constitution, free in action nor unanimous in doctrine."

Father Figgis has given a clear expression to this development: "Inside the polity of the church, the other (political) system had triumphed, and the development of the

¹ Churches in the Modern State, page 79.

papal system meant the transference to the Pope of all notions of illimitable authority claimed by the Emperor in truth." Even while papal development held the theory of the independent church, and Leo X and Charles V divided power in Europe between them, the religious and secular were inextricably interwoven in social life to the destruction of the former. The things of "Caesar" characterized society at Rome more than at Madrid.

The blow struck by Luther cleft papal absolutism, but shackled Lutheranism in as abhorrent a union with political power represented in the German princelings, and mingled in a more destructive confusion the secular and the religious in life. Luther broke the formal unity of the church only to make religion the subservient handmaid of modern nationalism—thus re-erecting that "middle wall" of partition between brethren which Christ through the church had broken down; and where Lutheranism was not successful in destroying the church it aborted in national episcopates owing preferment to national Caesars which in turn it crowned—and shrived. All that the Papacy had done politically on an imperial scale Protestantism has done on a national scale. Luther "bribed the princes with the wealth of the church, independence of ecclesiastical authority, facilities for polygamy, and absolute power,"¹ as Popes had bribed Emperors. Like Papalism, Lutheranism believed in the sword. Pope Gregory XIII ordered a mass of thanksgiving after the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and Luther gave to the Protestant state its dispensation in respect to a revolting proletariat: "Just let the gun deal with them." This is the ultimate method of the League of Nations now in case of national recalcitrancy. Protestant-

¹ Acton.

ism and the Teutonic development politically went hand in hand until the political representative of Lutheranism carried everything in Europe over the precipice of the German war. That he was assisted by the political representative of Romanism in the Austrian Emperor and that in the grand plunge they had the Sulton between them only re-enforces the argument.¹

Human life after the Reformation, in the strongholds of Lutheranism, showed at least as little freedom from secularism and materialism as Pre-Reformation Society—in short was just as pagan. Pope Alexander VI, surrounded at mass by his “nephews,” is not more incongruous in the Pre-Reformation Church than is Philip of Hesse in Protestantism with his two wives and indiscriminate progeny protected by the twenty-four articles of the dispensation of the Lutheran divines signed by Luther, Melancthon, Bucer and the Court Chaplain.

The present age of progress is commonly dated from the Lutheran Reformation and is peculiarly characterized by the activities of the Lutheranized nations. There are signs at present of a widespread opinion that the title is a misnomer but it will be conceded that the period is one of unprecedented exaltation of individual self-will, the destruction of authority, the prodigious increase in material wealth and the signal triumph of man over the forces of nature. It has zealously practiced the command of Genesis: “Subdue the earth and have dominion over it,” but it has neglected St. Paul: “Bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.” No respectable authority claims spiritual life and development as the distinguishing characteristic of human life at present even in the church itself.

¹ It was Luther who said that even the Turk was to be revered as authority.

If such a claim is made it is propped on an ignorant or sophistical substitution of material well-being for spiritual development, of the things of "Caesar" for the things of God. Criticism from the religious standpoint is difficult for it is subject to the unjust inference that it intends the disparagement of efforts at the well-being of man, higher standards of justice and a larger humanity. Of course it intends no such absurdity but it does intend a strenuous protest against the substitution of such things for the concrete faith, the devotional spirit, the sacramental life and the subordination of things material to things spiritual, which belong to any organized Christian life that has not cut loose from all that is expressed in the words Catholic and Apostolic—from the faith and order that characterized the Church in the first centuries of its existence. When considerations of justice and humanity are presented to that faith and order, separated from or as a substitute for spiritual life and interests it must ever meet with the stern demand, "Who made me a divider over you?"; or with the silence that followed the humane appeal concerning those Galileans whose blood Herod had mingled with their sacrifices.

The Christian Age of Progress when substituting the material graces of humanitarianism for the spiritual graces of a true Christianity would do well to regard with humility the same graces in the developments of pure paganism, e. g. the assumption by the Roman State, from the time of the Gracchi, of the burden of providing food for a quarter of a million of the proletariat of Rome (one quarter of the population of the largest city in the world), the interest of the Roman State from Vespasian to Marcus Aurelius in general education, and the response of Roman

plutocracy to its demands, the long line of pagan philanthropists, Nerva's sale of imperial jewels to make provision for the children of needy parents throughout Italy, Trajan's mortgage of forty-six estates for the maintenance of poor children, the charitable foundations of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius for young girls, Herod's gift of the splendid city of Tiberias to the poor of his tetrarchy, and the vast benefactions of Pliny in municipal libraries, public schools, public baths, and the relief of poor children, do but suggest the munificent philanthropy of the pagan state and its profuse effort, now recognized by impartial historians, "to add to the beauty, dignity or convenience of the parent city, to lighten the dullness of ordinary life, to bring all ranks together in common scenes of enjoyment, to relieve want and suffering among the indigent."¹

This altruistic development in human life which is as old as time reappears of course in modern life. It has always been a prop to materialistic development and to political power whether functioning through the charitable sodalities of later Roman paganism or in the modern Y. M. C. A. It sustains a part of the moral foundations of communal life, but it cannot be identified with the distinctive spiritual purpose of the Incarnation nor substituted for it; and it is in reality in conflict with the essential Christian principle that true spiritual life and development, individual or social, can advance only in and by the subordination of the material and secular. The bestowal of one's riches upon another was not urged in Christian teaching as a rule of conduct primarily for any good it might do that other. That teaching has very little in it of good to come from riches whether given to one by another or acquired by

¹ "Roman Society—Nero to Marcus Aurelius," Dill, Book II, Chap. I.

oneself. Accurately considered it teaches not so much the love of one's fellow man as the love of that fellow man's soul. The dole of primitive Christian charity was among fellow Christians. Nothing is more comic than the popular perversion of the idea of Christian charity into the notion of the duty of Christian self-sacrifice to promote an anti-christ lustful, voracious and carnal. The pure and essentially Christian motive does not loom large in modern philanthropy. "The Age of Progress" has yet to face the question of its attempt to substitute a politic altruism for the religion of Christ. After acknowledging with veneration all that proceeds from spiritual and moral elevation there is a large development based upon negative or ignoble motive. A thrifty and far-sighted capitalism that divides liberally with a proletariat armed with a vote and a bomb can not present large spiritual claims nor masquerade as the widow with her mite. Carlyle's epigram that gunpowder made all men equally tall is significant here. The convincing generalization of Lord Acton written in 1877 covers this subject. "Rousseau," he says, "led Marat to declare that the poorer classes were at war with society and had a right to all they could get by exterminating the rich and that their inflexible theory of equality together with the avowed inadequacy of economic science to grapple with the problem of the poor revived the idea of self-sacrifice which during the forty years of its revival has been associated with envy and hatred and bloodshed, and is now the most dangerous enemy lurking in our path."¹

In fact this idea as an underlying religious motive was eliminated in Lutheran teaching, and Justification by Faith Only, as a species of spiritual legerdemain made the reten-

¹ The History of Freedom in Christianity. Acton, page 58.

tion of materialism and sin harmonious with religious claims in Protestantism as prelatical plenary absolution made it possible in Romanism. The present suppression of the symbols of faith and visible acts of devotion in the daily life of men, the substitution for religion of a mere moral altruism, the disparagement of public religious services and ceremonies apart from philanthropic, social and political aims, the antipathy to the religious orders, the easy and almost universal elevation of every material interest over the spiritual, would seem to characterize a cultured paganism rather than a reasonable Christianity, no matter what the "philanthropic" contributions to life may be.

To claim in modern altruism or philanthropy a fulfillment of Messianic prophecy is to rival in irony the early Romans who in fear of the prophecy of the Sibylline Books that the Gauls would occupy a part of Italy, murdered a few Gallic captives, buried them in Italian soil, and thus defied the prophecy and sought to escape the divine will.

The Jew persisted in identifying the Messiah of prophecy with a political king and conqueror just as we persist in identifying a comfortable materialism with the kingdom of heaven and our national balance of trade with the pearl of great price. The teaching of Jesus had to be perverted or ignored through some ingenious theory, or occidental "civilization" would have gone down in the triumph of a Catholic and Apostolic Church long before that "civilization" reached its present *impasse*.

It is among the grim coincidences of history that Luther should have ushered in the religious influences operating in the Age of Progress with his famous sermon from the words of Genesis: "Increase and multiply and have dominion." His theology was hopeless, for the command was

given before the Fall and could apply only to sinless man to whom it was addressed. The words after the Fall could result only in the cosmic conditions recognized by religion as the fulfillment of the curse and by science as natural law. It was an arch-priest of science who wrote:

So long as unlimited multiplication goes on, no social organization which has ever been devised, or is likely to be devised, no fiddle-faddling with the distribution of wealth will deliver society from the tendency to be destroyed by the reproduction within itself, in its intensest form of that struggle for existence, the limitation of which is the object of society, and however shocking to the moral sense this eternal competition of man against man and of nation against nation may be; however revolting may be the accumulation of misery at the negative pole of society, in contrast with that of monstrous wealth at the positive pole; this state of things must abide and grow continually worse, so long as Istar holds her way unchecked. It is the true riddle of the Sphinx; and every nation which does not solve it will sooner or later be devoured by the monster itself has generated.¹

Lutheranized life is peculiarly the life of modern industrialism and capitalism and Luther's social code inculcated the principle of self-will and granted the privilege of the exercise of individual ignorance masked under the right of private judgment. It is wedded to present democratic development as Romanism was to absolutism. If Papalism and absolutism brought the lustful sordidness of Alexander VI, the self-indulgent epicureanism and pagan luxury of Leo X, and the political voracity of Clement VII, Lutheranism and democracy have brought their analogues in life today. Protestantism can not with serious countenance twit Romanism as the Scarlet Woman. The *tu quoque* is ready, for "the Harlot of religious history is ubiquitous,"

¹ Huxley's Essays. The Struggle for Existence.

and her seductions are as obvious in American democracy as in the autocracy of a Borgia pope.

The early Church kept marriage a sacrament and recognized the blessedness of little children; the mediaeval Church at least preserved the underlying primitive theories and formularies even though Caesarized and Mammonized—but it knew nothing in theory of the "*Crescite et multiplicamini*" of Genesis as expounded by Luther, or of the resulting modern theory of procreation for armies of soldiers in war and of factory workers in peace. The Age of Machinery came after 1500. "It contemplated the transformation of civilization into a vast development of the material accessories of life. It brought earth's greatest burden of woe in the economic problem."¹ It is indissolubly linked with the theory of competition as the law of life, with capitalism as fundamental in the divine order, with sordid depression of the life of the mass of men at present, however high in the standard of comfort in some ways, and the enervating and distracting accumulation of material goods and interests.

We cannot escape the historic sequence between Luther's famous sermon, *de Matrimonio*, delivered at Wittenberg in 1522, and the hundred thousand divorces in the United States in 1920, where the hand of Cæsar with the compliance of Religion has untied the sacrament of the Church and where Religion herself in many cases has applied the healing balm of re-marriage. Nor can we fail to identify the preaching by Luther of sanctified adultery in 1522 with the advice of the state to the decimated children of France, Germany and Belgium in 1917 for filling without the sacra-

¹ A Guildsman's Interpretation of History. Arthur J. Penty.

ment of marriage, the deplorable gaps in armies before the next war.

The war flashed out of industrial competition and political ambition centering in Lutheran development. It has been well called the last kick of fanatical nationalism, and Luther who united Protestantism to Nationalism. Religion had again to a large extent become panderer to the secular and material life of man whether in German absolutism or in American democracy. There was no unified and definite institution of organized Christianity to stay the voracious onslaught of material forces and desires, in short no organized institution to deal with human sin. The chief representative of organized Christianity, while claiming religious authority and unity in himself, shrank into silence in the Vatican while his spiritual children derided the one and shattered the other and cut each other's throats. National episcopates and the ministers of Protestantism were either silent in the hopeless knowledge that the maelstrom was the result of the sins of the system of which they were a part, committed long before; or else garrulous with the sophistry that the mission of the Christian religion was to exterminate the Hun and that the war was in some occult way a part of the Incarnation. The young republic of the West sent her armies to the conflict. The religious faith that shone in Cornelius the centurion was found in the heart of many a "doughboy" and the sacrifices of Christian priests and ministers rivalled those of early saints and martyrs; but religion in its widest development presented such strange phases as, contrasted with those of traditional Christianity, forced the inquiry whether religion on the whole had any existence apart from that materialistic humanitarianism essential to the propa-

gation of a materialistic civilization. Men, giving renewed proof of their creation in the likeness of God repeated the heroic deeds that have glorified human history since Thermopylae, but when the dying soldier at Chateau Thierry or Verdun made the pathetic inquiry: "Why must this be?" the answer was the same given long before at Austerlitz or Inkerman. When the priest brought the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ to the lips of dying men from the centers of the Christian religion he found that multitudes knew not what it was. At home, in London, in Paris and New York, an army of Christian profiteers divided profits with the tax collector and modern civilization found that war could be made profitable. Dynamite that blasted agonized bodies out of the trenches paid dividends at home. After two thousand years of Christian teaching the age of Cronos had returned and the civilization called by Christ's own name was found devouring the sons for whom He had died. The Dean of St. Paul's in his much discussed essay now sums up for us the entire development and seems to question whether in view of the war we may claim that civilized man has become more humane, more sensitive to the sufferings of others, more just, more self-controlled, less brutal in pleasures or resentments. And fact and contemporary authority seem to support the Dean.

We stand now at what would seem to be the end of the path—the end of that historical period that has been called the revolution of five hundred years. The transformation of religion into the state—the ancient process of history—we have brought to a development in democracy never so high. As Professor Royce announced from Harvard in 1913, "Man, the community, is the source of salvation." And another instructor of youth in a western college has

written: "Democracy is thus the modern method of fulfilling those needs which prudential and mystical religion arose to satisfy. No wonder that democracy has appealed to many minds as a substitute for religion, or perhaps *better*—as itself a religion!"¹ This is going further than Balzac's assertion that journalism is the religion of democracy. Current events seem to support the authors from whom we quote. Patriotism is identified as religion, soldiers with its ministers and the state with God Himself. In Christian churches we recite psalms to the flagpole and to the eagle. Christian cathedrals that are empty on the Feast of the Annunciation commemorating the initial fact in the Incarnation are crowded to the doors on Armistice Day.

A leading representative of religion wrote in 1919: "Jesus Christ fought our Civil War, as the event proved, and He is now fighting in the fields of France for the cause of His Kingdom. The true representatives of Christ and the Christian Church over in France and Italy are not the chaplains and Y. M. C. A. and Red Cross only or mainly, but the armies of the allies. They are doing just what He commanded them when He told His disciples to get a sword, and they are fulfilling His prophecy that He came to send a sword. The sword is an instrument of the Prince of Peace when it is wielded in defence of justice and liberty. There are times when the sword of the Spirit and the sword of Steel, the Bible and the Bayonet go together, and do the same work."²

So the buoyant Democracy, as convinced of its own in-

¹ Henry Wilkes Wright, Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy, Lake Forest University.

² James H. Snowden, D.D., L.L.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the Western Theological Seminary, "The Coming of the Lord," p. 272.

herent goodness and virtue as any Capetian king or Claudian emperor, and quite as much cajoled and flattered by the ministers of popular religion, comes in the end to self-apotheosis. The apostolic prophecy is again fulfilled and the son of perdition "opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God shewing himself that he is God."

In the presence of this deification the primitive Christian mind may revert for consolation to the episode of the coin with the image and the superscription of Caesar and find assurance in the silence of Jesus Christ.

The Dean of St. Paul's and Professor Bury in their consideration of the Idea of Progress agree that although the human race accumulates knowledge and experience as it accumulates wealth there is no sufficient proof that the moral and spiritual nature of the race shows any marked progressive transformation. The house man lives in may be swept, garnished and even refurnished from time to time and the data of his experience accumulated in the library but the same man lives in the house. We do not progress, but like mice in a trap we go round and round in our cosmic prison. Like the mice we can do nothing else unless some one opens the door. One opened the door ages ago, but men will not go through it, and He who opened it said something to the effect that few there be that find it. We have mistaken our repeated rounds for progress and now the conclusion of the ripest scholarship is that the Idea of Progress is something of a delusion. To quote the Dean again, "it is a superstition." Professor Bury maintains that that Idea was not present in the mind of man until the middle of the sixteenth century and has,

if any, only a relative value; and Dean Inge, assuring us that belief in it has been a working force in human society only for about one hundred and fifty years, concludes that he can see few signs of any social amelioration at present.

If the idea of progress is a delusion man may now go back to the point where the departure into the delusion left religion standing five hundred years ago, and take up the thread of that religion that runs so clearly through history back to the upper chamber at Jerusalem. He may have time and disposition to listen to the teaching of the Catholic and Apostolic Faith and may come to see that the religion of Christ is as fixed in its data as natural science, however mobile in its application to human life.

Souls that have hitherto lashed themselves to the chariot wheels of "Caesar," mistaking their futile revolution for progress, may now release themselves into the freedom and progress of the Incarnation,—may realize that while the things of Caesar change there is no such thing as progress in them, and that the things of God are the same yesterday, today and forever.

No pessimism can be found in the view that before each individual soul there is infinite progress toward the throne of God, and if this causes a certain indifference to the powers and activities of a civilization quite as splendid as Rome's, what matter? The Son of God regarded the one with silence. Why should the Christian not so regard the other?

"Heaven opened to a soul while yet on earth,
Earth forced on a soul's use while seeing heaven:
The Man is witless of the size, the sum,
The value in proportion of all things,
Or whether it be little or be much.

Discourse to him of prodigious armaments
Assembled to besiege his City now
And of the passing of a mule with gourds—
'Tis one! Then take it on the other side,
Speak of some trifling fact,—he will gaze rapt
With stupor at its very littleness,
(Far as I see) as if in that indeed
He caught prodigious import, whole results.”

The Crisis in the Episcopal Church

REV. GILBERT PEMBER

ONCE more the church is said to be facing a crisis. The Presiding Bishop and Council have issued a statement earnestly calling the church to face it and urgently appealing that the situation be relieved. Recently the Bishop of Pennsylvania called a meeting of selected representatives from each parish and mission in his diocese to consider it. There can be no sort of question as to the gravity of the situation in the church at the present time, or of the urgency of the challenge it makes to churchmen. Opinions vary as to the causes and as to the best way to meet it. There is only one thing for anyone who is in a responsible position to do, and that is to do his best in his way to lay the situation before the people and urge them to get at the real causes in themselves and the church to make them right.

THE FACTS

At the end of this first year after the Nation-Wide Campaign we are faced with a very serious financial deficit in the general work of the church. Estimates of what it will be by January 1st vary. The lowest I have heard is a half

million dollars. Some idea of the situation is gained from the fact that so far the Council has paid \$72,000 in interest for money which it has borrowed to meet contracted obligations for the support of our regular work. And even so our work in many missionary institutions and enterprises has suffered greatly for lack of funds to maintain it. There have been no funds for any advance work in the past year. And the Presiding Bishop and Council have so far, and wisely, refused to make any appropriations for new work for the year 1921. The reason is simple and compelling. With the certainty of an appallingly large deficit and no certainty of a larger income they cannot honestly do so. It is not only good business, but plain honesty, not to contract obligations when you have no reasonable assurance of the "wherewithal" to meet them.

The results of the Nation-Wide Campaign to date have been distinctly disappointing. I am aware of the fact that it is not considered proper to make a statement like that, and I shall probably be much censured in some quarters for doing so. There is a strange disposition to insist loudly that it has been a very great success. It reminds me of a small boy whistling to keep up his courage when he is going by a graveyard after dark. The facts are against the assertion of great success. The sooner we get down to the hard facts and realize what they mean, the sooner we will set things right.

The pledges made by the whole church for its general work in the canvasses made in December, 1919, and up to date, have not even approximated the amount asked for in the budget set before us last winter. And what is worse the amounts received so far are very far below the amount that was pledged. As a church we declined to pledge the

amount asked of us by the church. As a church we have failed to keep even the pledges made to the church. If that is a mark of "great success," then our standard of success is curious.

Much the same situation exists in many dioceses. I have never received so many and such urgent appeals for diocesan work as I have this year. The latest is the Episcopal Hospital with a deficit of \$70,000. On the first of October we had raised about \$400,000 on our diocesan budget of a million three hundred and odd thousand dollars. That is, with three months to go, we were about \$900,000, nearly a million, short of our budget. In three-quarters of the year we had raised less than one-third of what we asked.

CAUSES COMMONLY ASSIGNED

Many reasons for this situation have been advanced. I expect that each is in a measure true, and each has in it the danger that always goes with a half truth. It is a period of transition from one method of conducting the church's work to another. There was bound to be confusion. The cost of carrying on any work has increased so greatly that all religious and charitable work has been seriously crippled. All would agree in those things. It is frequently charged that there have been serious faults and blunders of management in the Central Office from the beginning of the Nation-Wide Campaign: haste of the kind that does not produce speed but does make waste; vagueness and confusion as to motive, method and purpose. The facts in large measure support the charges. One could wish that there were more signs of learning the lessons of experience. On the other hand, with equal insistence it is charged that diocesan and parochial authorities have failed to get in behind the campaign and work heartily, enthusiastically and

efficiently. There is truth in that charge. In part it is explained by the element of truth in the first one. If there had been less haste and more care, less thunder and more lightning, less confused running around and more directness, it would have been possible for those from whom leadership was demanded to give more intelligent and more efficient co-operation. There is the further charge that the people of the church, vestrymen and all, would not see "The Vision," make "The Sacrifice" to answer "The Challenge" and seize "The Opportunity." That also is in large measure true. And that, too, is in part explained by whatever element of truth there is in the other reasons assigned for the very qualified success of the nation-wide campaign to date.

THE REAL CAUSE?

The real trouble is not a financial deficit, but a religious deficit. It is not the lack or need of religion far off that is the truly disturbing thing, but the lack and need of religion at home here among us. The church's treasury is almost bankrupt because the church's people are religiously impoverished. The real crisis is not a matter of money, but of religion. And it is not a crisis that affects simply the missionary work of the church, but the life of the world, and that particular part of the world where you and I live. I dare to think that beneath all those superficial and more or less true reasons mentioned above and commonly assigned as the causes of the comparative failure of the Nation-Wide Campaign there is a more fundamental and far more startling and disturbing one. The nation-wide campaign tried to reap fruits of a quantity and quality that the root was not strong enough or good enough to bear. No sane man has any doubt that the world needs the kingdom

of God. No one has any real doubt of the ability of our people to give even the astounding amounts asked of the church. No one has any doubt that these great amounts could be spent to advantage. But even if there was absolute guarantee that the money was going to be spent wisely and for really worth while work, and even if there was positive knowledge that we had the ability to give it, we would still have to get the will to give it. The real question is this. Have we an amount of real religion, downright love for Christ Jesus our Lord, equal to the large demand made on us? If we have not, then it is futile to talk about the world's needs and our possibilities. The only thing that is going to help is to talk religion and get it. You have to have the religion before you can reap the fruits of religion. Of course, a good tree brings forth good fruits. We have sufficient authority for that. But you want to see that your tree is good before you plan on the fruits. It seems to me that we have spent a lot of time talking about, and trying to reap, a harvest for which we have not sowed sufficient seed. Our job is to talk less about fruits and get to cultivating roots.

Faith manifests itself in works. Creed expresses itself in deeds, of course, and that makes works and deeds of very great importance. We must get them and use them. But in the long run you get in works only the measure of a man's faith. And in the final analysis the amount of deeds is determined by the reality and depth of the man's beliefs. If we are to get increase of work and deed, we must increase our faith and deepen our belief. Again, if you would reap fruits you must cultivate roots.

Does this all seem very critical? Well, if it is, it criticizes no one more than the writer. It is my work to cultivate the root of religion in my parish. If the event proves

that the root of religion in my parish is not strong enough to bear the fruits rightly expected and asked by the church, then the fault is, at least in part, mine. And I tremble to think how large a part of the blame belongs to me. And I resolve to talk less about fruits and be more concerned about cultivating roots.

WHAT SHALL WE DO?

Let us become some one so that we may be able to do something. I am sure that is the right order. It does not help much to wring your hands in anguish over a sick man. That probably makes him worse. It is true but ineffective at that moment to discourse on the blessedness of the physician's profession. It does not help to tell the patient how much he needs a physician. It annoys him. If you are going to help, you must be or get a physician. It is all very well and necessary to talk about the great things religion can and should do for the world. But it never gets us anywhere until we get religion, or rather until religion really gets us. We have got to become Christians and better and best Christians, before we shall ever measure up to the standard of usefulness the church sets for us. We can produce today the fruit of a moderately Christian root, but the church is demanding of us the fruit of a complete Christian root, and the church's people do not measure up to it.

If we read our Bibles more and appreciated for ourselves the treasure therein contained, we would be more concerned in distributing Bibles to the heathen. Let us get a clearer understanding and a firmer grip on the fulness of the Christian faith, and we shall be more concerned for its preservation and extension. Let us really come to see how the church is bound up with, and woven into, the very fabric of the Christian religion, and we shall come to love it and be vastly more interested in its growth and extension. Let us

learn to pray more and better and bigger prayers, and we shall find ourselves lifted more and more into the complete will of God, and be more ready to do His will for the world. Let us by constant practice, regular and frequent, learn the joy of worship and then we shall be really interested in sharing that joy with Africa and China and Japan and the rest of the world. Let us, again by reverent and constant practice, discover more fully for ourselves the blessedness of sacramental living, and there will be a tremendous increase in our desire that the babies of Alaskan Indians shall have the benefit of Baptism and Confirmation and Eucharist. When we really care about Christ to the full we will not need urging to do Christ's will to the limit.

This is the key to the whole situation. The humiliating thing about this constant, chronic state of crisis is that it indicates lack of religion rather than lack of money. And it is that lack which it ought to be our first and supreme endeavor to supply. All sorts of parish programs, schemes of organization fearfully and wonderfully made, innumerable "best methods," are being suggested to us from almost every conceivable quarter. Often they carry on their face the evidence that the builder of them has never had much actual experience in running a parish. Here is the program I want to suggest. Let each one of us try to make his parish as a whole more constant in searching the Scriptures, more firm and understanding in the church and the church's faith, more joyous and faithful in common worship, more frequent and reverent in attendance at the Holy Communion, as the great act of Christian worship, the sure pledge of the presence and fellowship of our Lord, and the great means of getting His life and power into our life. Let us, all of us together, cultivate these roots, and the proper and necessary fruits will come in abundance.

The Imperative Need for Good Church Schools

REV. JOHN H. YATES.

THERE was a time in the history of Christianity when it was as natural for people to go to church as to breathe. They went to church in those days (i. e. the middle ages) not only once a Sunday nor only twice on Sunday. They went to church on week days. They kept all manner of saints' days. They had church festivals and church fasts which were observed for days at a time by whole communities, even nations. They went to church before undertaking any great public enterprise, as, for instance, a war or a crusade. We have a survival today of this appeal to religion in times of great public danger in the practice of calling the nation to prayer in war-time, as was done by Lincoln during the Civil War, by Mr. Wilson during the World War, etc. But this is only a survival and is never taken very seriously by the country at large. In the middle ages such appeals to God for guidance and strength were taken very seriously. Then, too, in those days, men went to church before engaging in any private enterprise of vital importance to themselves. It was as though business men today should go to church in a body before forming some great corporation; or laboring men, before organizing a union. Everybody went to church in those days upon innumerable occasions and no one was thought queer for doing so.

Yet we have a suspicion that the religion of the mass of the people of Europe during the middle ages was largely, if not entirely, a second-hand affair. It was more in the nature of custom than vital religion, so that people went to church because everybody did it, just as people today,

who are able to do so, keep up with the fashions. A man's religion, to be worth much, must spring from personal spiritual experience. He must have a truly vital relation to God and his faith must be built, not upon other folks' opinions, but upon some degree of first-hand knowledge of the religion which he professes. It is true that there were many people in the middle ages whose religion was first-hand and there were a few notable men and women whose lives shine out like lighthouses across the restless sea of the intervening centuries—men like St. Bernard of Clairvaux, to instance one, and women like his mother. Such men and women however were rather the exception than the rule. They were religious geniuses. The religion of the masses of the people was, as I have said, second-hand. Worse than this, it was often a mere superstition whose compelling power was fear. For this reason the Christianity of the middle ages disintegrated, and the ground had to be cleared for a more vital and personal faith.

The Reformation struck the death-blow of authority in religion in large parts of the modern world.* For years the reformers clung to the idea of authority, merely transferring the seat of their unquestioning veneration from the church and pope to the Bible; but this position could not be forever maintained, and authority, having been driven

* My remarks about the Reformation are meant to apply to the question of authority only. I would not have anyone suppose that I am endorsing that movement *in toto*. Neither would I have any one infer that I condemn any movement in the church, or outside of it, whose purpose is to restore any good thing which the Reformation may have discarded. I believe that the reformers did throw away much that should have been retained. I believe, moreover, that the movement tended to over-emphasize the intellectual element in religion to the neglect of reverence, and of worship as an end in itself. But we are not now considering these questions which I mention merely to avoid possible misunderstanding.

by the reformers from the front line trenches, was gassed out of the second and third lines, in turn, by their successors. Changes of this kind take place very slowly, of course, as men measure time, and they never take place along the whole line at once. Often, too, when driven from one part of the line, the old belief reasserts itself, regaining for a time its lost position. Thus we have the church of Rome, with its innumerable adherents, still professing faith in the authority of the Pope—holding tenaciously to the front line,—and we have reactionary Protestant bodies vociferating vehemently through the gas-mask of prejudice against any infringement of the authority of the Bible. Meanwhile the world, as a whole, moves on, dragging the unwilling conservatives forcibly behind its ox-drawn chariot. (To-day the oxen have been replaced by gasoline motors.)

What does this mean? That Christianity is destined to pass away? Not at all! It means that Christianity is striving to come into its own as a religion of the spirit. "God is a spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." To worship in spirit and in truth implies an intelligent, first-hand worship. The worshiper must have some acquaintance, however little, with the object of his adoration, and some knowledge of the reasons which justify his act: otherwise there is no true worship. This, in turn, implies education.

Religious education, in other words, is a necessary accompaniment of true worship and of all spiritual advance. Not by returning to the outworn methods of the past can we hope to instill greater vitality into the church. Retrograde movements may have for a time a semblance of success, due to the fact that there are always many people who, it may be through no fault of their own, do not know

the lines along which true progress is working, and who therefore, with commendable zeal but mistaken judgment, are ready to go in for anything which promises a change from the dullness of present methods. But such movements will fail, are bound to fail, in the long run. Any dream of a golden age in the past is based upon an illusion. The truly wise are they who dream rather of a golden age to come, and who work zealously for its coming. If we would save the church and the world, we must, under God's leadership, advance along such lines as our best modern scientific research may indicate. The very word "science" sometimes leaves a bad taste in the mouth of the theologically educated. Science is disliked by religious people largely because it has thrust its unsparing knife into the heart of many pious beliefs and venerable customs and there is no telling how far it may yet go. Also it is distrusted by all who hate uncertainty. Such cry out that science changes its conclusions from year to year, almost from day to day, so that what is scientific one moment is unscientific the next. That this is so is of course inevitable when the choice is between stagnation and death, on the one hand, and progress and life on the other. There is no life where there is no progress, and progress involves change. Constant progress means continual change. It is perfectly true that every change is not necessarily for the better. A change may be, not for the better, but for the worse, in which case the result will be, not progress but its opposite. Still it is far better to go forward along the wrong road for a time—if anyone is seeking the way home—than it is to go backwards, or even to stand still, for where there is no definite guide-post to indicate the right way to travel, the only way to determine which road is the right one may be to try, for a time, the wrong one.

Fear, custom, authority, as compelling motives in religious work have largely passed away. Where they still exist they do so as religious "vestiges" and as such can serve no vital purpose. This means—and here we come directly upon our subject—that men and women will be Christians today only because they believe that they ought to be Christians. Moreover this belief must be a reasonable belief and cannot be forced. It must be the result of deductions drawn from an adequate knowledge of the facts involved. All of which implies education. We ought to rejoice that this is so. There are those who regret the passing of the "good old days" when everybody went to church. This is a perfectly natural regret for anyone to entertain who is discouraged by the present wide-spread indifference to church work. It was bad religious education, or entire lack of it, in recent years, that is largely responsible for this present-day indifference. A few generations ago, when the momentum of the ancient custom of regular church-going began to slacken there should have been a movement in the interest of religious education to take the place of the dying custom, as a dynamic agency. This movement did actually take place but it did not receive the attention nor the backing which it deserved. It is not necessary to criticize our ancestors too severely. They did the best they knew how to do in their day, doubtless. They may not have been fully aware of the dying out of the custom in question; it happened so gradually. We have not this excuse.

How are people to be brought to the conclusion that they ought to be Christians; that it is their duty to support the church by working, giving, and by loyal attendance? No conclusions can be reached apart from a knowledge of the facts from which they may be deduced. And where the de-

cision has to do with a Christian and a churchman, there must be more than knowledge of mere facts. There must be a certain spirit in a man's heart, a certain love of truth, of humanity, of God, before he can reasonably be expected to come to a right decision regarding questions of so spiritual a nature. Without the right spirit in his heart a man will inevitably distort the mere facts of the case and so draw from them a wrong conclusion. Before a man can decide whether or not he ought to be a Christian, he must have some adequate knowledge of what Christianity is, why it is what it is, why it is the best possible religion, how it came into being (and are there not a great many half-hearted Christians who do not know these things at all: who have not the least notion of why Christianity is worth while?) and he must have, as was just said, some measure of the Spirit. To give him these things is the task of religious education, and, in the long run that means it is the task of the church schools. Parents, god-parents and friends often do laudable service in the way of imparting this education to children, but they cannot do the work of the church school as that work ought to be done.

But when we have said that certain facts and a certain spirit must be his possession before a man can rightly decide religious questions—when we have said this, we have not yet said enough. For not only must these things be present, but they must be implanted early in life, before other habits of thinking, of feeling—of living, in short—are formed incompatible with the desired conclusion. It is of course possible for a man to be converted to Christianity late in life; but in the first place the chance of this happening is, all things considered, slight, especially today when there is no longer any overwhelming social sentiment in

favor of Christianity; and in the second place, even in cases where people are converted to Christianity late in life, they are then starting at the point where they should have started years before and so have lost the advantage which would have come from having been Christians through all their early years. They will never be the same as they would have been had they had an early start.

The Master must have had this truth in mind when He said: "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." The child-mind is plastic, is easily inclined in the right direction, and children are not sophisticated—though they soon become so—but are trustful, humble, and ready to learn, and so have already some of the characteristics of the citizens of the kingdom of heaven. Right here, if I may turn aside from my topic for a moment to a closely related subject, is the strongest argument for infant baptism, an argument which I have never seen advanced on its behalf. Theologians when they discuss the question of infant baptism, are usually so absorbed by the question of the conferring of supernatural grace thereby, as to overlook the very important practical fact that baptism is a bringing of the child to Christ, together with the giving of a public pledge to keep him there. The very act of bringing a child to Christ in this way signifies that we firmly believe that from earliest infancy a child can have some real relation to Christ, can come under Christian influence. The sponsors then pledge themselves to see that the child shall have a Christian education. Let no one object that the child of a month old, or even a week old, is too young to be educated. Such an objection argues ignorance of child-development as taught by our best modern psychology. We now know that

the child begins to be educated the very moment he draws his first breath, and who shall say how soon he begins to be influenced by the Christian love in the heart of his mother and in the lives of those about him? This thought is really somewhat appalling to weak, sinful man. The responsibility which it places upon adults is, in many, too grievous to be borne. But it ought to convince us, at least, of the more than human wisdom of the world-wide and age-long practice of infant baptism. Its bearing upon religious education is equally obvious.

Modern educators, through the study of psychology, physiology and related subjects, have, as we all know, discovered many important laws and have come to important conclusions regarding the education of children. They have reached these conclusions and discovered these laws chiefly as the direct result of a careful study of the child-mind. Educators have said, in effect, "Suffer the little children to come unto us, that we may the better understand them to the end of helping them to learn." To treat of these laws and these conclusions would be quite beyond the scope of this brief paper; and fortunately our purpose does not require that this should be done. This much, however, may be stated in this connection as bearing most decidedly upon the subject before us:

1. We must have church schools if we are to have church people.

2. It is better to have no schools at all than to have poor schools.

Is it necessary after what has already been said to prove these deductions? It ought not to be. The imperative need for good church schools is, then, no delusion. It is not the preaching of a few cranks who have lost their sanity some-

what through brooding over the decline of religious influence in the world, or some other equally interesting problem. Rather it is the well-balanced conclusion of men who see that the one way in which it is possible to bring people to the point of being Christians, in any true sense of the term, and of keeping them at that point, is by educating them to the necessity of their being such. There is more energy spent, in this enlightened generation, in selling people useless books, or valuable books if you will, than is put into teaching children the fulness of the faith. And a book agent, in these days, does not go forth to convince the public of the value of his wares until he has first undergone a course of instruction in the psychology of salesmanship longer and more arduous than the average churchman would be willing to submit to in order effectively to teach his children the truth as it is in Christ Jesus.

Can we not realize that if only we had good, up-to-date church schools, with as many teachers as might be needed and these properly trained for their work, with all the material we might need, and with the backing of parents and church people generally; schools therefore full of interest for pupils and teachers, in which the pupils would never experience a dull moment; that then we would be able to hold our own children, and that we would draw to our schools children who now go nowhere to Sunday school?

We are in a vicious circle in our church school work. We have poor schools because people lack interest in them and people lack interest in them because they are poor schools. Of course we now have in many parishes good schools, but these are the exception. It is the general condition that is under consideration here. Leaders in the field of religious education are everywhere working conscientiously to bring

about a better condition of affairs. But, in spite of all that has been done so far, we are still in the preliminary stage of this great undertaking; the stage wherein it is necessary to work hard in the effort to arouse interest in the movement on the part of the very people who are most vitally concerned in its success. Speaking generally, parents are still quite indifferent about the religious education of their children; while even the clergy, in many places, seem to be satisfied with outworn methods and heart-breaking results. It is vain to suppose that we have outgrown this first stage and that all we need to do now is to devise methods and courses of instruction. This we must do, of course, but we cannot leave the other undone: namely, the work of stirring up interest. We can never have good church schools until there is a demand for them on a scale great enough to justify the expenditure of large sums of money for religious education. What would our public schools, which are by no means perfect even now, amount to if the general public had as little interest in them as the religious public has in church schools? We would not expect to find good public schools in a community which should say to its superintendant of schools: "Go ahead. Organize schools. But don't expect us to send our children to them unless we happen to feel so inclined; nor look for any money from us above such an amount as you may be able to collect from a few philanthropically inclined souls." Yet this is at present the average state of affairs in our church school work.

The problem of religious education is a life and death problem for the church. Education is the one means left to us of creating and sustaining interest in church work. How is this problem to be solved? By hammering away

at it, in season and out of season. Everybody must be roused! Even some of the world's statesmen, whom we are apt to think of as being quite indifferent to the problem of religious education, even they are awaking to the fact (which was perhaps not so apparent before the war) that religious education and civilization are very closely bound up together! Under the leadership of her efficient Board of Religious Education, the church must push the cause of the Christian education of her children. Every bishop, priest, deacon, deaconess and every organization in the church at all qualified to do such work, must co-operate in this task, until all our children are receiving adequate education in the faith and practices of our holy religion.

The Gift of Counsel

REV. FRANK H. HALLOCK, D.D.

THIS gift is in ordinary speech "good advice." "As we give counsel to others when we direct them in the right way, so we receive counsel from the Holy Spirit when we are instructed by Him as to what we have to do in order to advance rightly in the way of salvation" ⁽¹⁾. Unlike wisdom it is in no degree intuitive, it is deliberative. Yet it is not, of course, to be sought in the functioning of the unaided human mind, for "who ever gained knowledge of Thy counsel, except Thou gavest wisdom, and sentest Thy Holy Spirit from on high?" ⁽²⁾ Counsel utters "what seems good to the Holy Ghost and to us"; mark the conjunction, for it does not necessarily present that which seems good to the human

(1) A. Devine, *A Manual of Ascetical Theology*, p. 253. (2) *Wisdom* 9:17.

mind acting alone, and it may often be radically opposed to what the human mind would choose. It is not the voice of a mere majority in whom the Holy Ghost is not present. Councils and churches have erred through failure to perceive this, so we have "Latrocinia" and "Athanasius contra mundum"—not to take more recent examples. We recognize the need of the divine spirit of counsel in our "Prayer to be used at the Meetings of Convention," and by His presence the dangers that we sometimes have reason to fear are averted. We repeat this gift does not act intuitively: "Counsel in the heart of man is like deep water, and a man of understanding will draw it out" ⁽³⁾. Deep water is good water, but it is not, like that which lies upon the surface, to be obtained without effort.

Let us see some of the definitions by which it has been described. "By counsel we apply these principles" (the moral principles and laws discerned by knowledge) "with sound moral judgment" ⁽⁴⁾. "The spirit of counsel helps us to be guided by God's will in deciding on our vocation, and all matters of duty" ⁽⁵⁾. "The spirit of counsel directs us to make a right choice as to the use of means for attaining the end which wisdom sets before us, for carrying out the lessons which understanding teaches" ⁽⁶⁾. We ask for it when we pray that "we might have a right judgment in all things" ⁽⁷⁾.

It is the gift that we need especially for the formation of a rule of life. How many there are who spiritually are

⁽³⁾ Prov. 20:5.

⁽⁴⁾ Dr. F. J. Hall, *Theological Outlines*, vol. 3, p. 60.

⁽⁵⁾ Bp. Grafton, *A Catholic Atlas*, p. 113.

⁽⁶⁾ Bp. Hall, *Confirmation*, p. 115.

⁽⁷⁾ Dionysius the Carthusian, "*Consilium est habitus supernaturalis a Spiritu Sancto infusus, quo in operationibus humanis movemur secundum consilium Spiritus Sancti id est secundum directionem ejus qua nostra consilia dirigit, vel certe vicissim praeveniando inspirat.*"

like Topsy, who misconceive the nature of a rule, think of it as tending to make one mechanical, and resent all claim of authority on the part of the church to impose, or, even, to suggest the advisability of, a rule! When S. Justin Martyr spoke of the gifts Trypho replied, "I should like you to know that you are talking nonsense" ⁽⁸⁾. Does not one hear a very similar answer today from those whom a perverted private judgment leads to spiritual anarchy? This is quite unlike the old conception; the prophet writes to those who are following the guidance of counsel, "thine ears shall hear a word behind thee, saying, This is the way, walk ye in it; when ye turn to the right hand, and when ye turn to the left" ⁽⁹⁾; the Psalmist prays, "Show Thou me the way that I should walk in for I lift up my soul unto Thee" ⁽¹⁰⁾. Counsel is in the supernatural order what prudence is in the natural. One does not learn the heavenly harmonies of music without the help of a teacher, one does not acquire the niceties of the pronunciation of a foreign tongue until he has listened to the speech of one to whom it is native, and one does not learn the trade of sainthood apart from the guidance of counsel.

Again, we need the gift in deciding difficult cases of conscience, in answering questions as to vocation, in determining conflicting claims of family, state, church, self, as they may arise. Knowledge, as we have seen, enables us to discern what is right and what wrong; counsel enables us to choose between two things, both good and right, the one which is better, higher, more pleasing to God. Dr. Ewer describes it as "a power to see the highest good." As we advance morally and spiritually there is an ever-increasing need of the gift, for the distinctions we have to make are

(8) Dial. 39. (9) Isa. 30:21. (10) Ps. 143:8.

finer, they belong less to the natural order and more to the supernatural. So it leads us, step by step, into a life more like that of the Son of God and His company of saints and makes us realize our vocation. We have noticed how necessary it is in the forming of a rule of life with proper provision for prayer in its various forms, for communion, confession, self-denial. A wisely-chosen director may help us in this way—and he is able to help because he speaks that which counsel puts upon his lips, but, if we are deprived of his help, and in innumerable cases of detail all must be, we have direct appeal to God and here counsel keeps our consciences from languishing, from becoming anaemic.

Heroic virtue proceeds from the voice of counsel pointing out a more excellent way, a way often opposed to the suggestion of common-sense. We have said above that it is in the supernatural order what prudence is in the natural and, of course, when the two come into conflict the lower must give way ⁽¹¹⁾. It may often be opposed to prudence, it bids us “launch out into the deep and let down our nets for a draught”, while prudence may bid us hug the shore. At the same time it keeps us from the rash presumption of those who “ask not counsel at the mouth of the Lord” ⁽¹²⁾, for it is joined with wisdom. “Just as the cardinal virtue of prudence leads men to act wisely and cautiously in temporal matters, so does the gift of heavenly prudence lead us to act wisely in spiritual matters. If we listen to its voice it will mould and fashion our whole lives in accordance with the will of God” ⁽¹³⁾. Lecky, and not only rationalists generally, but those also who walk in the safe ways of common

⁽¹¹⁾ Froget in his “*De l’Habitation du S. Esprit dans les Ames Justes*” enlarges upon this point.

⁽¹²⁾ Joshua 9.14.

⁽¹³⁾ Dr. A. T. Wirgman, *The Sevenfold Gifts of the Spirit*, p. 65.

sense, may deride the austerities of the pillar-saints and the extraordinary paths chosen by many of the early ascetics. But, after all, they bore a witness of which we can readily conceive the need in their own time. We are not called upon to imitate them in details of their conduct, new times bring new demands, but there is need of their spirit which set the things of the world, its pleasures, its luxuries, even when these were not wrong in themselves, at naught and chose the royal road of the cross. The need for mortification never ceases though we may need to change our practices and revise our conception of what is central and essential, for it is not merely negative, not practiced primarily for its own sake—else the true Manichæan would be the most perfect ascetic, but it is a means to an end. We may note here that it is this gift which has built up the ascetic theology of the church, and one of the masters in this field says: "The chief thing in mortification consists, not in the performance of the austerity, but in the casting off of our own will, for that is properly the true mortification and renouncing of ourselves that Jesus Christ requires of us in the Gospel" (14).

This leads us to another function of counsel that we may turn aside for a moment to notice. Counsel directs the operation of the will, steers it safely between the Scylla of self-assertion and the Charybdis of passivism. For the surrender of the will we have the highest example, that of Him Whose Name was called "Counsellor" and Who said, "Not My will but Thine be done," and in the prayer which He taught us, "Thy will be done"; at the same time we have been endowed with free-wills which are not to be denied, but to be brought into conformity with His, so that we will

(14) Rodriguez, *Practice of Christian and Religious Perfection*, vol. 2, p. 56.

what He wills. An improper expression is this aspiration in a current devotional manual: "that my own will may be found in none of my works." One's will is to be found in all one's works, not, of course, as self-will, but as will freely and voluntarily conformed to the divine will. Still it is the assertion of the independence of the will that we have most earnestly to strive against today. An example of the truly Christian use of the will is that of David praying earnestly for the life of his child, willing with the whole force of his being that it should live, but at once accepting the divine will when it is revealed. We are to strive, aided by counsel, for a willingness to do God's will whenever it is revealed; but we must make no abnegation of our own will for it is the gift of God to us, to be used voluntarily, by effort, in His service. "Our wills are our's, we know not how; our wills are our's to make them Thine." We might summarily describe the purpose of the diverse gifts as leading us to discover and giving us power to fulfil the divine will, and thereby attain the purpose of our creation, realize our destiny, for "*nella sua voluntade e nostra pace.*" "It is manifest, that the highest perfection does not consist in interior delights, nor in sublime raptures, nor in visions, nor in having the gift of prophecy, but in making our wills so conformable with the will of God, that whatever we know He shall desire, that also we shall desire with our whole affection; we shall receive what is bitter as joyfully as what is sweet and pleasant, remembering that such is the will of His divine majesty" (15). Counsel gives the obedient ear of Samuel: "Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth." Present-day science joins in commending the old and often almost forgotten way of self-discipline; William James says that

(15) S. Teresa, *Book of the Foundations*, chap. 5.

we should do one hard, self-denying thing every day that when the time comes for the making of a great decision there may be sufficient moral fibre.

Counsel, again, keeps our religion from becoming a sickly, emotional, neurasthenic aestheticism. Dr. James in his *Psychology* urged that every emotional stimulus should be followed by a practical reaction, the pleasure of a concert should move one to give his seat in the car to a lady obliged to stand or to speak kindly to the disagreeable old aunt that he finds at home; if some such reaction does not follow the emotional disturbance has been harmful rather than helpful. It may be profitable to apply this suggestion to some of the religion that one occasionally sees.

Counsel distinguishes between true and false mysticism. False is merely emotional; true bears the print of the nails, never appears where the way has not been prepared by asceticism ⁽¹⁶⁾, for mysticism, in the final analysis, is simply the operation of God the Holy Ghost reproducing the Godlike in us. God never hastens, so those who are led by counsel follow long in the way of Martha before they come to that of Mary. Mysticism has a rational element, it is not, as Victor Cousin said, "the despair of the intellect which has begun to doubt the power of reason"; it appears most perfectly where understanding and wisdom have been conspicuously active. Finally, the mysticism which is the product of counsel has a social interest, a strong humanitarian trend; it is not self-centred, it does not neglect the second command in the summary of the law for all its absorption in the first. "The reason why God's servants love creatures so much is that they see how much Christ loves them, and

(16) Dr. Moberly's definition may be noted in this connection, he says, "Mysticism is the experience of the Holy Ghost," *Atonement and Personality*, p. 312.

it is one of the properties of love to love what is loved by the persons we love", said S. Catherine of Siena. "It would not be difficult to maintain the thesis that all true socialism is builded, and can be builded alone, on a foundation of mysticism, and that any socialism which strives to build otherwise builds nothing but hay and stubble" (17).

This leads us to think of the gift of counsel as it is used in the service of others. "No man who has been confirmed is without some *charisma*, which becomes his contribution to the general wealth of the church" (18). Counsel enables him not only to speak a word in season, but to speak the right word and speak it forcefully, because he speaketh not of himself but of that which is given unto him. It is the charism needed particularly by those who have to instruct others, priests, teachers, parents, but there is opportunity for its use given to all and the church suffers as we individually fail to appropriate and apply what we have been given. At the opening of the great Anglo-Catholic Congress the Bishop of Zanzibar described the real purpose of the meeting, recognizing the drift of men and women away from the church the congress assembled to place itself at the feet of Christ and ask "Lord, what would Thou have me to do?" Surely not the least of the causes for this generally acknowledged drift from the church is the failure of those who have received the gifts to use them, and especially to counsel those who stand without to try that wherein we have found joy and peace. The responsibility belongs to all and cannot be delegated to a class within the church, to the priesthood, as is all too commonly done. "The gift of counsel has been defined as that grace which the Holy Spirit

(17) Dr. W. F. Cobb, *Mysticism and the Creed*, p. 38.

(18) Dr. A. J. Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, p. 301.

bestows upon us whereby we are enabled to work out our salvation in relation to others. It is the gift which deals with humanity, as in essence social" (19). Think how the common possession of the Holy Spirit knit all the followers of Christ together in the early days and made them one in the unity of the catholic church, "one body and one spirit." This was a oneness of life unlike that of any human fellowship, it was the oneness of an organism, not that of an organization. "They had all things common" is wholly inadequately interpreted when we think of as indicating what we should nowadays call a socialistic ideal; it was an inner unity, to which the external unity of possession was merely incidental. Personality isolates, the Holy Spirit solidifies, consolidates, makes us one, concerned each vitally with the well-being of another who shares in the same life.

The presence of the gift in an unusual degree soon becomes recognized and the possessor is given abundant opportunity for its exercise, so S. Bernard of Clairvaux, S. Francis de Sales, Keble, Pusey, Liddon, carried a heavy burden of correspondence and their spiritual letters as published are valuable additions to the library of spiritual guidance, for the difficulties which perplexed their correspondents are the same that often trouble us today.

(19) G. F. Holden, *The Holy Ghost the Comforter*, p. 97.

St. Agatha for February

MINNA CAROLINE SMITH

AGATHA of Catania appears to have been the biggest and most beautiful girl among the early heroines of the Faith who were spared to our calendar by the reformers. All the legends about her and all art concerned with her represent her as one of those glorious large women whose youth is radiant with splendid strength. In a famous painting by Moretto in the Church of St. Clement at Brescia she is shown with the other four virgin martyrs who most interested the Italian painters, and she is taller, more gracefully athletic, much handsomer and more attractive than Agnes, Lucia, Cecilia and Barbara in the same picture. By the way, St. Barbara was not left in our calendar, but she is a very interesting Eastern girl; so is Eugenie of Egypt; like Mary of Egypt these were omitted for one reason or another.

The Sicilian Agatha belonged to a rich and prominent family, one of those whose condition on earth most affected the imaginations of many chroniclers. She suffered the attentions of the Roman prefect; she refused to listen to him; she was persecuted by an odious woman at his command; she ran away to Palermo to escape; she was brought back and, remaining firm in her fealty to her Lord, was cast into a dark dungeon. Again on trial and offered freedom, she made reply: "The service of Lord Jesus is the true freedom, the only nobility." She was put to torture of fire, but at the beginning of the flames a great earthquake came and the people begged so tumultuously for her that the order was given to cast her again into prison. There a hideous torture was applied, known to more than one Christian American woman in nurse service in darkest modern days; her

breasts were taken off. The magnificent courage, faith and resignation glowing on her beautiful face are excuse for some of the paintings of this scene. In others St. Agatha is shown only with the pincers of this torture, as, for example, in a window of Winchester Cathedral in England.

St. Agatha's Day, February 5, is, of course, celebrated in the same week with the Presentation in the Temple; and her day is specially beloved in Sicily, where she is invoked against fire. About a year after her martyrdom there was a terrible eruption of Mt. Etna, and the people of Catania, both pagan and Christian, flocked to her tomb of porphyry to implore aid of her intercessions. An ancient story relates that on the summit of this huge mountain near Catania is a vast gaping chasm, whence are vomited fire and smoke, said by Blessed Gregory to be "one of the mouths of hell." On this occasion "the mountain opened its mouth and there flowed forth a stream of fire carrying all before it; and the inhabitants of Catania, taking from St. Agatha's tomb her silken veil, fixed it on the end of a lance, and went forth with it in a long procession to meet the fire; and it pleased God that the fire was turned away, and the mountain ceased to bellow and roar, and there was calm. On beholding this miracle many of the heathen who dwelt in the city were converted to the Faith and received baptism."

Always the supernatural element of endurance of pain through faith is the basis of the people's sainting of the martyrs in those early days; torture was common; hideous methods of death for those who opposed them were usual as sunshine to all oppressors. And when this power might be again applied to their own lives, through the aid of those who had conquered pains or death these people naturally had little difficulty in believing in the Communion of Saints.

The Church and Social Problems, IV

CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF

Criticisms of the Church's Social Policy and Work.

IT is no new thing to assail the church. In all ages, all places, the question has been asked "What is the matter with the church?" thereby implying that something, somehow, was lacking. We hear in many quarters, now, as always, that the church has lost her grip on the lives of men and her supremacy among moral and spiritual forces. She is declared to be decadent; to be subservient; to be indifferent to the call of the problems of the present day. A recent critic declared that "There is something wrong in the method of preaching religion when, after 1900 years of Christianity, there is so much injustice, misery and sin in the world. If the church condemns socialism, then she would also condemn our present system of government of the people by the power of money, and she should be the first advocate for real freedom for every man, woman and child on God's earth."

Let us consider some of the criticisms from those within the fold of the church, some of which grow out of the zeal of the worker, who is impatient that more rapid progress is not being made or who may be of that group of "impractical idealists or sentimentalists" as Dr. Rylance called them. Then there are those who deliberately pursue the policy of underestimating the advances made in order to spur the laggards and indifferent to action.

Bishop Potter in an address at Chautauqua furnished an illustration of the latter type of criticism. He asked: "What is the relation of the church of God to the social unrest of the country? There is no more righteous arraignment of the church of our time than her indifference to the social condition of the classes made up of less favored men and women. The church has been severely and justly criti-

cized for her lack of interest in the mental, moral, and physical upbuilding of the masses. The church should take active steps to cure the physical and mental, as well as the religious ills of the people. Her neglect of this vital work cannot be remedied too soon. It has been careless of its most important function."

In one of the pamphlets issued by the former secretary of the Joint Commission on Social Service, he said "now the striking fact is that thus far the church, which should be in the van of any effort at human uplift, has lagged in the rear of the contemporary social movement. The church, which once assumed, and rightfully assumed, leadership in ameliorative or curative work for the ills of society, has unfortunately failed to assume such leadership in the preventive movement of our day—the movement which would not merely succor him who has fallen by the wayside among thieves, but which would effectually see to it that no one need fall among thieves, for the good and sufficient reason that there should be no thieves among whom to fall. To clear the Jericho road of robbers is, in Bishop William's phrase, the new version of the parable which is demanded by the spirit of our day. "In this contemporary work of social prevention, which implies a gradual if not abrupt social reconstruction, the church, as we have intimated, has much to learn from the experience of secular agencies."

In a leading editorial discussing Dr. Washington Glad-den's statement that the church was facing a social crisis, the editor of *The Living Church* said, that it would ill befit churchmen to wrap themselves in a mantle of self-satisfaction. "If," he declared, "in the providence of God, this church has attained to a position of influence that, on the whole, did not welcome apostolic Christianity, it must be that responsibility has been incurred in the exact measure in which influence has been attained."

After discussing the evil of the "accumulation of power in the hands of a few" the editor proceeded to comment as follows: "Unhappily, the church is far from free from complicity in this evil. 'The church,' says Dr. Gladden—by which he may be presumed to mean the whole body of men who 'profess and call themselves Christians'—'has been standing by and looking on, winking her eyes and twiddling her thumbs, and wondering whether she had any call to interfere.' And some very severe words in regard to the extravagance and the complicity of members of our present General Convention in these wrongs have appeared in secular papers." He points out that "Dr. Gladden lashes 'the church' for complicity in at least the first of these evils.

" 'Indeed,' he says, 'she has gathered into her communion many of the most conspicuous of the perpetrators of the injustices—they are nearly all church members—and has made herself a pensioner upon their bounty and has been content with preaching to them the simple gospel 'that such men always love to hear.'

" 'The fact is plainly apparent that the church has lost its grip on the world, and she is not going to regain it until she finds out what is her real business in the world. Her enfeeblement is due to her failure to grapple with the task assigned her. Let her address herself to that with faith and courage and she will soon find her resources returning. It seems to me that the responsibility now resting on the church in America is something tremendous. If this nation is destroyed, the guilt will lie at the door of the church.' These are strong words; but we dare not say there is no justification for them.

"What can the church do? It is of little value that committees of General Convention or of other bodies issue, now and then, pretty essays relating to the conflict between

capital and labor or to the unravelling of other social evils. The church must use all her spiritual forces toward giving higher ideals to the nation. The sense of personal responsibility must impel men to deal righteously with each other.

"Now this cannot altogether be done by virtue of preaching. We do not underrate the power of the pulpit when we say that it is not sufficient to the task. There are great preachers who can powerfully influence their hearers for good in great crises of mind, but they are few and far between. On the whole, sermons on social subjects, delivered by average preachers, generally repel by reason of their very inadequacy. Yet it does not follow that they should be omitted."

The Bishop of Michigan, who has already been quoted in these articles in another connection in an address¹ said:

"The church commonly and shamefully had failed to do its duty to bring about a true democracy, and it is just beginning to awaken to its divine obligation."

Here is an English churchman's view of the situation, especially as it affects America:

The American people are looking out for a religion. Socialism cannot, as it may in Europe, become that religion. With eager hearts the American people ask the church to show the right and wrong underneath the strivings of today. The Christian church is still asked, although patience cannot endure forever, to reveal where earth touches heaven. Christianity has still a chance to become the soul of the world. A creed human and divine is needed; but to prove how human it is, the Christian creed must embrace whole realms of experience hitherto unknown to orthodox Christianity. A symbolism that symbolizes is needed; not a mere record of the thoughts and aspiration and manners of earlier centuries. A conduct is needed that will step over current standards and act out of deep conviction. In America, as in England, one asks, Will the Christian church hear

¹At St. James Church, Milwaukee, April 10, 1908.

and see? Will it allow that Spirit, which it claims moves within, to speak?²

Walter Rauschenbusch in an essay on "The New Evangelism" charges that the church has hitherto failed to Christianize international politics; that the church has not broadened its ethical teaching to any great extent." "It still confines its ethics to the personal and family life. . . the church has failed to keep place with a movement so rapid" as the modern social movement; that "the present paralysis of the churches affects all Western Christendom, and only a course coterminous with modern civilization will explain it."

The Watchman, a leading Baptist weekly, editorially declared that,

It is precisely because the Christian church has failed to make this impression of personal love and helpfulness that it has lost its hold on the masses of the people. It is because it has not carried out the teachings of Jesus, and has not continued to follow the example of the primitive Christians that a large part of the charitable and fraternal work which the church should be carrying on has been undertaken by other agencies, which take also the credit and the power which should have been retained by the church. A study of the character and life of the victorious early church shows plainly that if the church had continued to fill the same sphere in the lives of its members and in the life of the world, there never would have been any need or any opportunity for the founding of young men's and young women's Christian associations. There would have been no place in the social life of the people for the numerous fraternal and benevolent orders and societies which now occupy so large a place in the social life of today; nor would there ever have been need or opportunity for the organization of labor unions, because the church would have provided everyone with work or with sustenance in case of disability and aid in all cases of need.

²T. C. Witherby, in *The Commonwealth*.

The editor of a leading monthly appealing to a feminine constituency³ had a symposium on "What is the matter with the churches." In his letter asking for contributions to it, the editor declared that in the last ten years there had arisen a chorus of criticism which concerns the Christian church in general, and in all countries, and that in so far as we Americans are concerned it was particularly interesting as regards the church in the United States. There has been, he asserted, much talk of the church outside the church; that the Christian church was dying; that it was not making use of the property, buildings and organizations already in its hands; that interdenominational disputes stood in the way of a reasonably united effort for worthy sociologic and humanitarian causes. "It is charged," he said, "that owing to the weakness of the church it is unable to meet or understand the sociologic drift of the time; that intelligent and capable youth cannot be drawn into its ministry; that men of worth-while caliber at work in the world cannot be induced to fill its pews; and that the real needs and spiritual desires of the people are misunderstood or neglected."

Dr. Josiah Strong's reply was perhaps the most significant. He said that "during the first half of the century an individualistic religion was adapted to an individualistic civilization and, therefore, made rapid growth. During the last half there was a marked development of the social spirit which increasingly checked the growth of individualistic churches because they did not meet the needs of the new condition. What ails the churches is that they have failed to recognize the social side of their mission. Churches here and there have gained the social spirit and have made a surprising growth, attracting men especially."

³*The Delineator.*

There is another phase of criticism which must not be overlooked. It is that which deals with the question of efficiency. A writer in the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* pointed out that the efficiency of Christ's ministry—as distinct from its inspirational power—has received too little attention. Efficiency tests of religious work have not hitherto been applied sufficiently, because the writer said “religious leaders have not felt responsible for unsanitary living and working conditions, or for misgovernment that causes distress and vice and inability to comprehend and heed the gospel message. Goodness, spirituality, religious fervor, should not be permitted to manufacture evil or to waste opportunity to do good. Efficiency tests use to the utmost character, good intention and religious fervor by adjusting burden to capacity and by requiring effort commensurate with opportunity.”

Here we have some striking illustrations of the indictments that have been directed against the church, not by its avowed enemies but by those who are its avowed friends. Some are within our own fold, some without. All are entitled to the current designation of the term Christian. Some of the criticism is directed against our own communion, some against the church at large. Some bear in mind the great and fundamental distinction between Protestant and Catholic, some ignore it. Some distinguish between those bodies which are based on the individualistic conception of the church, some bear in mind the corporate conception. They all show that among a considerable group there is a feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction.

One of the clergymen answering the editorial inquiry to which I just referred was a well known Methodist leader, the Reverend Dr. Frank Mason North. He gave this

thoughtfully intelligent reply to the question as to what was the matter with the church in America: "First, it is growing. Second, it is reducing its divisions. Third, it is measuring its task." He concluded with this declaration, "that which is the matter with the church is the pains and perplexities of growth; the process of modifying her organization for the better, the phenomena attending her effort to remeasure her task and adapt herself to the needs of her world, under the guidance of the Master of Life." Here is a clear recognition of the facts. Here is the sort of facing of the situation that helps. It does not discourage. It does not depress.

There is a growing group of Christian men and women who are keenly alive to the facts of the existing order of affairs; who are deeply concerned regarding the problems of modern life, but who nevertheless have not allowed themselves to be stampeded, who have continued to maintain.

In a striking article in *The Educational World* Thomas J. McMurray furnishes a sample of the newer order of reasoning. He points out how Christ, when He walked among men was frequently, one may say constantly, confronted with the social problem, and how He aimed to bring the discordant classes of humanity into closer and more cordial relations with one another. "The supreme remedy for the social inequalities and social wrongs complained of is that brotherhood," as Mr. McMurray shows, "which the Gospel of Jesus advocates and enforces. Let us look at the real attitude of the church with reference to the social problem. I have no sympathy with the cry raised by a certain class, to the effect that the churches are the enemies of the working classes, and that clergymen 'sustain the blood-stained banner of capital and fraud.' Some individual churches and a few clergymen may be guilty of the charge;

but they are emphatically the exceptions. The rule is that churches and clergymen are in hearty sympathy with the toiling, struggling classes, in harmony with Christ, who came to preach the gospel to the poor and deliverance to the captive."

It is nothing new to have the deficiencies of our day deplored as exceptional and alarming. It has always been so. Present evils are always large by comparison, due to their nearness to ourselves. What is incumbent upon each one of us is to appreciate the magnitude of the phenomenon surrounding us. Behind the scramble, the unsatiable hunger, the unscrupulous unconcern, which disfigure so much of modern industry, "there is a mass of life that looks to the higher rather than the lower law. While this is so, we may hope for that kingdom of heaven which requires something exceeding law, even brotherhood."

This may be regarded as essentially the view of the thoughtful, alert churchman who, cognizant of the power and influence and history of the church, and, who blessed with good sense and a sweet reasonableness, realizes that a perfervid overzealousness is apt to over-reach itself and not only fall far short of its goal, but in all likelihood keep others from reaching it.⁴

In a sermon on "The Social Service of the Early Church" in a series of sermons at the Emmanuel church, Boston, dealing with "How Christianity Conquered the World" the Rev. Ellwood Worcester taking St. Matthew XXV: 35, 36 as his text referred to "that inward world of spiritual power and mystery which formed the dynamo of a vast

⁴See "Christian Theology and Social Progress" by F. W. Russell, Brasenose College, Rector of Sisland, Norfolk. The Bampton Lectures for 1905. The central truth of these lectures is that the indebtedness of social progress to the faiths and hopes of Christian belief is great. Christian theology has had much to do with the development of social life.

system of machinery which the earliest Christians devised and set in motion for the salvation of a perishing world. This great movement" he said "was not the result of reflection; rather it was the reflection of the life and spirit of Jesus Christ from whom Christianity sprang more directly than any other religion ever issued from its founder. In Him, as in His religion, we see this admirable balance between the inward and the outward, between inspiration and achievement, between love of God and love of man, between spiritual power and practical service. No words spoken by Jesus better describe the genius of His religion than His story of the Last Judgment, where, relying only on the dictates of His own heart and life, He passes His judgment on all human action. Of this service of ministering love, He, in the short day of His life, set the everlasting example where His Church followed. 'Whoso would be the first among you shall be the servant of all, for even the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister.' "

So through His example, His word, and His death, Jesus taught His disciples the highest, the most important, the most difficult truth man will ever learn from religion,—to believe in the love of God. We may extend our religious knowledge in other respects, but however far we extend it, we shall never surpass the simple statement of St. John: "God is love." This is a lesson man has never learned from Nature, but only from a divine life, that is to say, in its perfection only from Jesus Christ. It is in His light that we see light.

"Every great religious teacher longs" Dr. Worcester says "to communicate his faith and himself in a hymn which shall be sung and loved by believers forever. The greatest and most splendid utterance of St. Paul is the hymn which begins with the words: 'Though I speak with

the tongues of men and of angels and have not love, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.' From the beginning Christians felt themselves to be brothers in Christ Jesus, and we have two unimpeachable witnesses to this fact. The nimblewitted Greek dramatist, Lucian, mocker of Christianity, who lived in the second century says: 'Their original law-giver taught them that they are all brethren, and they become incredibly alert when anything threatens their common interest; on such an occasion no expense is grudged.' Tertullian the Church Father, who lived at about the same time, says in his Apology: 'It is our care of the helpless, our practice of loving kindness, which brands us in the eyes of our opponents. Only look, they say, how they love one another (themselves being given to mutual hatred!) Look how ready they are to die for one another (themselves being ready to kill one another!')'."

So the Gospel became as he points out a social message and its propagation a social movement. It took men out of their old relations, out of this world of sin and sorrow, but it introduced them at once to a new and sweeter human fellowship. Slaves, servants, humble and despised persons without friends suddenly found themselves beloved and honored members of a small, but devoted circle of believers in Christ, cherished and esteemed for their moral and spiritual qualities. The gospel, he said, "from the beginning, showed itself both individualistic and social—individualistic in the infinite value it placed on the soul and on the inner life; social, in that the very essence of its spirit, which is saving love, demands social expression. Its profound difference from modern socialistic schemes which dispense with the religious motive altogether lies in the fact that it does not find its working principles in community of material interests and of goods, but in unity of

purpose and spiritual ideals, contemptible as these may seem in the eyes of those who regard only material values as real values. Nevertheless the Christian idea has worked. The movement which began only as a single ripple on a wave of Jewish dissent, in the course of three hundred years acquired an energy which swept all ancient religions, all vested interests, all social customs and institutions before it."

By far the largest share of criticism of modern Christianity comes from Protestant sources and concerns Protestant Christianity. Dr. Shailer Mathews, a professor in Chicago University, and a Baptist clergyman in an introductory note to a series of articles in *The World Today*, of which he was editor, had this to say:

There have always been critics of the church, just as there have always been critics of every institution and person devoted to the higher things of life. Within the past few years in particular has the church been subjected to severe criticism. Both by its enemies, and its friends has it been told that it was growing out of sympathy with its age and becoming, at least among Protestants, an institution of the capitalistic class, whose membership was rapidly becoming feminized; whose ambitions were too exclusively over-worldly; and whose leaders were afraid of a candid and scientific investigation of their teachings. To a very considerable extent these criticisms were just, and are still just, but they are as far as possible from being the whole truth. Within the past few years, and particularly within the last two or three years, churches of all denominations have been passing through a very remarkable awakening. It is no time for the friends of the church to despair. It is rather time for them to take account of stock and realize on their assets. They have been counting their liabilities too long.

Dr. Graham Taylor, founder and director of Chicago Commons, a well known social settlement, and a Congregational minister in an article on "The Social Advance of the Churches" in *The Survey*, pointed out that the Protes-

tant churches of the United States are calling an advance into the social, civic and industrial spheres for influence and action. The fact is the more notable because this advance movement is actually taking place during the sharpest decline they have experienced since the reaction they experienced in the first half of the 18th century.

In discussing the "Church's Place in Sociology" the former *Church Standard* commented upon Prof. Franklin H. Gidding's classification of social activities under such groups as the economic; the moral; juridical; and political, (including governmental institutions and the parties and reform associations that are formed to secure their administration in accordance with certain ideas); and the cultural, which includes educational, literary, and religious activities. "Churches," by which Dr. Giddings apparently means congregational groups and establishments for religious worship and instruction, are assigned to the same sociological category with schools, debating societies, and social clubs. "Such is the place that 'the church', in the sense of any church on a city street-corner, receives in scientific sociology," the editor of *The Standard* declared.

Of the church as an institution with a distinctly social ideal, reaching to the end of the geographical world in space, and to the end of human history in time, he appears to know nothing. This is all the more remarkable because Professor Giddings at least awards to the positive Christian conception of the development of human character the highest place in the foretold results of the operation of social tendencies, and virtually predicts its permanence and ultimate dominance.

Now it may be due in part to the "two-and-seventy jarring sects" or more into which Christianity is divided that this scheme of sociology does not recognize the existence of the Church idea. Still, the Apostles' Creed, in which oc-

curs the sentence "I believe in . . . the Holy Catholic Church," is accepted by some 350,000,000 Catholics—Anglican, Greek and Roman—and by fully 150,000,000 more Christians who do not call themselves Catholics in any sense. The vast majority of the Christians in the world will agree that Jesus Christ founded a society, as recorded by His four biographers; and that He provided that it should be self-perpetuating to the end of the world, for the purpose of teaching all nations to observe the things that He had enjoined upon His disciples. Those things are universally recognized as of the highest social value. In the words of *The Standard*,

We venture to say that there is no other science in existence whose professors would so far ignore a society that had endured through eighteen centuries for the purpose of teaching the human race the principles whose triumph is recognized by that science as the ultimate goal of its evolutionary progress.

Whatever else the Church may claim to be and teach, she claims to teach the principles and ideals recognized by Dr. Giddings as likely to become "increasingly influential" as social evolution continues. Whatever else the Church may claim to provide in the way of means to glorious ends, she offers to human society the means of attaining these ideals as taught by her Founder. Perhaps there is no greater stumbling-block in the path of social progress than the refusal of the Christian world to accept the Sermon on the Mount as a means, instead of merely reverencing it as a picture of the end, the millennium of the conventional expectation.

We are willing to admit, again, that Christians and their several organizations are in part responsible for this failure of a youthful science to recognize the most stupendous phenomenon in the field. There has been a decided tendency among many Christian bodies for centuries to make their activities "cultural" rather than "moral"—to refer once more to Mr. Giddings' classification. But the principle of all its principles which attracts to Christianity the votaries of the self-cultural religious of the pagan world—Buddhism and Con-

fucianism, for example—has been its other-cultural or missionary principle. They are individualist religions merely; and while it, too, is an individualist and spiritual religion, it is also a social religion, entrusted by its Founder to a society for the purpose of teaching social ideals, and practising them for the universal benefit of man.

We have expressed some astonishment that the admittedly imperfect science of sociology should have so far overlooked the Church idea, viewed simply as the ideal of a group of organizations whose great ends include under a new heaven a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. These secular ends are the goal of progressive or dynamic sociology, according to the most eminent expositors of that science. But it is equally astonishing that these expositors should have overlooked the possibilities of this great group of organizations in respect to the means of attaining the common and desirable social end; should have ignored their common creed-clause of belief in one organization; and should have failed to call on them to move for its consolidation, in line with the confederative tendencies of the age, as the greatest of all means to the social education of the world.

This somewhat extended comment on Professor Giddings' classification applies with equal force to other writers.

The great fact of the relation of the Roman Catholic church to workingmen is seldom referred to in the laments of Protestants over their slackening hold upon the toilers, yet it is most significant. Here we have a vast religious organization, the very life-blood of which in this country has been the attachment of the working classes, but do we find it saying it must move heaven and earth to bring itself up to date and become "socialized?" Nothing of the kind. On the contrary, the weight of Catholic authority has been against socialism; and the Pope is as much opposed to "modernity" in labor and political movements as in theological. Doubtless, the Roman Catholic church in the United States loses power over many immi-

grants and other workingmen who, by antecedent faith, ought to be in her communion. But making all allowances for such defections, it retains a wonderful hold upon those very masses which, we are now told, can be won over only by petting labor unions and taking up with half-baked doctrines labelled 'sociology'."

It is essential to bring out clearly and distinctly the difference between the Protestant and Catholic ideas of the church, a difference which affects the attitudes of the two great classes into which Christendom has been divided. It is not in any controversial spirit that the reference is made, but it seems essential to a clear understanding of the situation that one should refer to the distinction at such length as may be necessary to prevent misunderstanding.

Primarily the Protestant idea of the Church is of a group or organization of men deeply imbued with their religious duties, worshipping God as to them seems wisest and best. To quote again the words of the Dean of Worcester: "The church is looked upon as consisting of a number of converted individuals; and individuals pass readily from one group to another because they regard one group as being as good as another; and a man may please himself as to whom he associates with, and under which preacher he prefers to 'sit'." In other words, the voluntary feature is the predominant one.

Naturally such bodies are to a large measure laws unto themselves and it is not surprising to learn that a well known Congregational church in New York City, feeling the call to social and civic activity proceeded to *adopt a platform* in which it favored, for instance, "a national tariff in which no special interests are fostered at the expense of the people; a state legislature which will not authorize absurd pensions for the sake of strengthening a party;

ernment that will not enrich a few bosses at the expense of the rentpayers!"

judges who will not appoint commissioners who make fortunes out of dilatory condemnation proceedings; a city gov-

From the same conception sprang the labor churches, so far few in number. A Reformed clergyman, falling out with his consistory, withdrew from his congregation and established a labor church, which was endorsed and supported because for a number of years he had espoused "the cause of the poor and industrial classes, in defiance of bitter criticism from those who do not, or will not, understand his motives, and that he has the unbounded sympathy of a majority of the citizens regardless of creeds. We wish him God-speed in his new and noble field of labor. Ministers who have the courage of their convictions are coming to the front with refreshing rapidity, and deserve to be generously supported!

The London Labor Church was established to advocate the following principles:

1. That the labor movement is a religious movement.
2. That the religion of the labor movement is not a class religion, but unites members of all classes in working for the abolition of wage-slavery.
3. That the religion of the labor movement is not sectarian or dogmatic, but free religion, leaving each man free to develop his own relations with the Power that brought him into being.
4. That the emancipation of labor can only be realized so far as men learn both the economic and moral laws of God, and heartily endeavor to obey them.
5. That the development of personal character and the improvement of social conditions are both essential to man's emancipation from moral and social bondage.

"The Church," as it has been understood for nearly 2,000 years, however, means something more than a voluntary organization to promote secular ends, no matter how laudable they may be. To many who leave the Church do so through a mistaken emphasis on or a mistaken idea of their own importance. Too many who indulge in virulent attacks or pessimistic utterances do so because they are disappointed because the Church has not in her organic life endorsed their particular panaceas for social ills. Because she does not advocate their hobbies therefore she is wanting in perspicacity and is deficient in moral force and courage! Nevertheless the Church persists. She is performing her two-fold service to God and to man, as she has for 2,000 years, and will no doubt, so far as finite eyes can discern, continue to do so until her appointed end shall arrive. In the meantime it is a proper question for devoted and devout communicants of the Church to ask "Has the Church an immediate function in connection with pressing current-day problems and if so, is she discharging it in the spirit and in the letter and with efficiency?" Believing that she has and that it is the duty of every Churchman, in the words of the Christian Social Union: "1. To claim for the Christian law the ultimate authority to rule social practice. 2, To study in common how to apply the moral truths, and principles of Christianity to the social and economic difficulties of the present time. 3, To present Christ in practical life as the living Master and King, the enemy of wrong and selfishness and the power of righteousness and live," these articles have been written. It is my hope that time and opportunity will be afforded to discuss certain specific phases of social problems from the Church point of view.